

A
D E F E N C E
OF THE
Commonly-received Doctrine
OF THE
H U M A N S O U L,

AS AN
Immaterial and naturally-immortal
Principle in Man,

AGAINST
The OBJECTIONS of some MODERN WRITERS:
INCLUDING
The true SCRIPTURE-DOCTRINE of
DEATH, LIFE, and IMMORTALITY,
AND OF
The NECESSITY and EXTENT
OF THE
CHRISTIAN REDEMPTION.

By THOMAS BROUGHTON, A. M.
Prebendary of SARUM, and Vicar of St. Mary Redcliff, and
St. Thomas, in BRISTOL.

*I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and
the God of Jacob: God is not the God of the Dead,
but of the Living. Matt. xxii. 23.*

B R I S T O L:

Printed for T. CADELL, in Wine-Street; and Sold by
Messrs. JOHNSON and DAVENPORT, Bookfellers, in Paternoster Row, LONDON. M.DCC.LXVI.

hr *

1942.96.11

C 1134.1.35*

C 1134.8.35*

P R E F A C E



THE following Papers were intended as an Introduction to a Work (in some Forwardness) to be entitled, A Prospect of Eternity or the Life to come, in four Dissertations. (Theological and Critical) on I. The State of the Dead between Death and the Resurrection. II. The Resurrection. III. The Judgment of Man-kind by Jesus Christ. IV. The final State of Retribution.

As these Dissertations proceed upon the supposition of an immaterial and naturally-immortal Principle, or Soul, in Man, and the separate Existence or Survivorship of that Principle, for Soul, after the Death of the Body; and as this commonly received Doctrine of the Christian World has

A 2

H



P R E F A C E.

THE following Papers were intended as an Introduction to a *Work* (in some Forwardness) to be intitled, *A Prospect of Futurity or the Life to come, in four Dissertations* (*Theological and Critical*) on I. *The State of the Dead between Death and the Resurrection.* II. *The Resurrection.* III. *The Judgment of Mankind by Jesus Christ.* IV. *The final State of Retribution.*

As these *Dissertations* proceed upon the Supposition of an *immaterial and naturally-immortal Principle, or Soul, in Man, and the separate Existence or Survivorship of That Principle, or Soul, after the Death of the Body; and as this commonly-received Doctrine of the Christian World has,*

iv P R E F A C E.

from Time to Time, been called in Question and opposed, and, of late in particular, been more strongly attacked than ever, by some Writers now living: I thought it necessary to defend a Doctrine, the Refutation of which would destroy the very Foundation of my first Dissertation, and affect much of the Reasonings employed in the rest.

The Appearance of these Papers in a detach'd Way, and separate from the Work they were designed to accompany, is owing to the Publication of a late Piece, intitled, *A short Historical View of the Controversy concerning an intermediate State, and the separate Existence of the Soul between Death and the general Resurrection, deduced from the Beginning of the Protestant Reformation, to the present Times: With some Thoughts, in a Prefatory Discourse, on the Use and Importance of Theological Controversy.* London,

P R E F A C E vi

don, 1765. As the *Anonymous* Writer of this Piece (whom I shall distinguish by the Name of the *Historian*) has, in the *Prefatory Discourses*, and several Parts of the *Historical View*, re-inforced the attack on the commonly-received Doctrine, and urged the Objections brought against it, with great Strength of Language and seeming Cogency of Reason and Argument; I judged it proper to *hasten* the Publication of the following Papers (which may be considered as a *distinct Treatise*) the sooner to prevent the Impression, so plausible and artful a Performance may make on the Minds and Judgments of its Readers, to the Disadvantage of the *Truth*.

But our *Historian*, how dextrously soever he has acquitted himself of the Task he undertook, is not to be considered as the *Leader* of the present Attack on the Doctrine of
Natural

Natural Immortality. That Honour belongs to the learned Master of St. Peter's College in Cambridge, Dr. Edmund Law; who, not long since, revived the dormant Controversy concerning the intermediate State, and the separate Existence of the Soul, in a Discourse on the Nature and End of Death under the Christian Covenant, and an Appendix and Postscript, subjoined to his Considerations on the Theory of Religion, in three Parts. 4th Edit. London, 1759. I have the highest Opinion of Dr. Law's Abilities, as a Scholar and a Divine; but cannot help saying, that his Book, consisting of the Considerations and the Appendix, &c. puts me in mind of Horace's motley Picture, which

Definit in Piscem. Mulier formosa superne
De Arte Poet. v. 3.

With these two Writers (the Master and the Historian) I have joined

joined the *anonymous* Author of a late very extraordinary Performance, intitled *Universal Restitution, a Scripture Doctrine*. This proved in several Letters wrote on the Nature and Extent of *Christ's Kingdom*. Wherein the Scripture Passages, falsely alledged in Proof of the eternity of Hell Torments, are truly translated and explained. 1761.

As the whole Strength of the Cause lies with these three contemporary Writers, I thought it unnecessary to go any farther back to Opposers of the common Doctrine in former Times; and have, therefore, confined the following *Defence* of That Doctrine to the Objections of Dr. Law, and the two above-mentioned *anonymous* Authors.

It may not, however, be improper, or unentertaining to the Reader, to insert here some Account of one or two of the most eminent
 joined

of these Gentlemen's *Predecessors* in the laudable Attempt to subvert the Doctrine of the *Human Soul*.

The first I shall mention, is, The Author of *Second Thoughts concerning Human Soul*, demonstrating the Notion of *Human Soul*, as believed to be a *Spiritual Immortal Substance*, united to *Human Body*, to be a plain *Heathenish Invention*, and not consonant to the Principles of *Reason, Philosophy, or Religion*; but the Ground only of many absurd and superstitious Opinions, abominable to the reformed Churches, and derogatory in general to true Christianity. London, 1702. This Writer (Dr. William Coward, a Physician) assumes the fictitious name of *Esthbius Psychalethes*, from these Greek Words *ἡ βίος ψυχὴ ἀνθρώπου*, *Life is truly the Soul*. This expresses his general Hypothesis, that the *Human Soul* is nothing more than "a Breath" originally infused by God into "insensible

“insensible Matter, by which it
 “lives and exerts Sense and Reason.” Which being, properly, a
 Definition of Adam’s Soul only,
 he extends it to the rest of Man-
 kind, by adding, that “God made
 “the Subject (*the Human Soul*) ca-
 “pable at the Beginning, and
 “gave it a Power to produce its
 “like; i. e. living Creatures to pro-
 “duce living Creatures, and con-
 “vey original Life in the Vehicle
 “of Seminal Matter, from Gene-
 “ration to Generation.” And, lest
 he should be thought by this Doc-
 trine to make Man wholly mortal,
 he says, “Mortality properly relates
 “to a perishing Substance, which,
 “by its returning to Corruption,
 “returns to its primitive Matter—
 “But Life or Soul cannot be pro-
 “perly said to be mortal or cor-
 “ruptible, because it truly returns
 “to God who gave it.”

insensible

B

Dr.

X P R E F A C E.

Dr. Coward, it is probable, took the Hint of his Performance from a *Traët*, published as long ago as the Year 1644, said to be printed at Amsterdam, and afterwards re-published, with Additions, at London, 1665, under the Title of *Man's Mortalitie, or a Treatise, wherein it is proved both Theologically and Philosophically, that whole Man (as a rational Creature) is a compound wholly mortal, contrary to That common Distinction of Soul and Body: And that the present going of the Soul into Heaven or Hell is a mere Fiction: And that at the Resurrection is the Beginning of our Immortality, and then actual Condemnation and Salvation, and not before.*

A learned and solid Answer to Dr. Coward's Book (among others, by Dr. Nichols in his *Conference with a Theist*, Mr. John Turner in *A Vindication of the separate Existence of the Soul, &c.*) we have in a Work intit-
led

led *Psychologia*: Or an Account of the Nature of the Rational Soul: In two Parts: The First being an Essay towards establishing the received Doctrine of an immaterial and consequently immortal Substance, united to Human Body, upon sufficient Grounds of Reason. The Second, A Vindication of That received and established Doctrine against a late Book called *Second Thoughts*, &c. wherein all the Author's pretended Demonstrations to the contrary, as well Philosophical and Rational, as Scriptural, are fully refuted; together with occasional Remarks on his Way of Reasoning. To which is annexed a brief Confutation of his whole Hypothesis. By John Broughton, A. M. Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Marlborough. London, 1703.

The *Historian*, in his Account of Dr. Coward's Book (Section 18.) complains, that "notwithstanding the
"many Proofs," the Author gave,

“of a firm and serious Attachment
 “to the Authority of the Christian
 “Scriptures, he has commonly made
 “one in the List with Toland, Tin-
 “dal, Collins, &c. reputed to be the
 “most rancorous and determined
 “Adversaries of Christianity.” But,
 did not Toland, Tindal, and Collins
 write with as professed a Regard
 for the Scriptures, as Dr. Coward,
 and equally pretend to support
 their Hypotheses on the Foundation
 of Holy Writ? And, if Dr. Cow-
 ard’s Hypothesis is manifestly sub-
 versive of a great and important
 Truth, common both to Natural
 and Revealed Religion, I think he
 is placed in very suitable Company,
 and, I believe, will be called upon
 by very few Christians to quit the
 honourable Post assigned him.

The Historian pretends, (*ibid.*)
 that “some worthy Persons of the
 “present Times, who think as Cow-

ard

“and did (tho’ probably for Rea-
 “sons a little different from those
 “he gives) have found themselves
 “obliged to disown all Acquaint-
 “ance with him, and indeed have
 “sufficiently made it appear (by
 “the wrong Accounts they give of
 “his Book, retailed from Inform-
 “ers, who certainly never read it)
 “that, wherever they had their
 “Principles, or their Materials, it
 “could not be from Dr. Coward.”

Who the “worthy Persons,” he
 speaks of, are, he does not tell us.
 But, whoever reads Dr. Coward’s
 Book, will be thoroughly satisfied
 (notwithstanding the Proverb, *Great
 Wits will jump*) that succeeding Wri-
 ters against the Immortality of the
 Soul have been better “acquainted
 with,” and more obliged to, the
 Doctor, than they are willing to
 acknowledge.

The

The other Writer, I proposed to give some Account of, is, the truly learned and ingenious Mr. Henry Dodwell; who, among several excellent and useful Writings, was unluckily induced to publish an *Epistolary Discourse* against the *Immortality of the Soul*. Not having Mr. Dodwell's Book by me, I must be contented to represent his Hypothesis, as it is given us, in his own Words, by Dr. Samuel Clarke, who has effectually confuted it. "The Soul" (Mr. Dodwell pretends) "is a mere *Flatus* or Breath; which
 " must make it cease to be, when-
 " ever God is pleased to cease to
 " breathe it; as being unable to
 " continue its Duration, by the
 " Powers given it at its first Pro-
 " duction, and the Continuance of
 " those general Influences, which
 " are requisite for the Support of
 " all created Beings in general—
 Con-

“ Consequently, the Soul of Man
 “ is naturally mortal, and will of
 “ itself perish and come to no-
 “ thing, if not upheld by the ex-
 “ traordinary Power of God, in a
 “ præternatural Way.—However,
 “ by Means of the Christian Dis-
 “ pensation, the Souls of good Men
 “ are præternaturally immortalized,
 “ by the Divine (*adscititious*) Spirit,
 “ to Happiness, and the Souls of
 “ bad Men, by the Will of God, to
 “ Punishment.” See Dr. Clarke’s
Letter to Mr. Dodwell; wherein all the
Arguments in his Epistolary Discourse
against the Immortality of the Soul are
particularly answered, and the Judg-
ment of the Fathers concerning that
Matter truly represented. Works in
 Fol. vol. 3. p. 719.

It is a little surprizing, that our
Historian, in “ deducing the Con-
 “ troversy from the Beginning of
 “ the Protestant Reformation to the
 “ present

"present Times," should omit so
 considerable a Part of it, as That,
 which passed between two Writers
 of such Eminence in the Repub-
 lic of Letters, as Mr. Dodwell and
 Dr. Clarke. But, perhaps, he chose
 (and he did wisely) to keep out of
 the Reader's Sight so masterly and
 decisive a Performance on the Sub-
 ject, as Dr. Clarke's Letter: which
 (to use the Words of Bp. Hoadly's
Preface to the Doctor's Works) "he
 "wrote with such a Spirit of Clear-
 "ness and Demonstration, as at
 "once shewed him greatly superior
 "to his Adversary in Physical and
 "Metaphysical Knowledge: and
 "made every intelligent Reader
 "rejoice, that such an Incident had
 "happened, to provoke and extort
 "from him That Plenty of strong
 "Reasoning and Perspicuity of Ex-
 "pression, which were indeed very
 "much wanted on this intricate
 "and

“and obscure Subject. And I am
 “persuaded” (adds the Bishop)
 “that, as what he has writ in this
 “Controversy comprehends the
 “little that the antients had said
 “well, and adds still more Evi-
 “dence than ever clearly appeared
 “before, and all in Words that
 “have a Meaning to them; it will
 “remain the Standard of good
 “Sense on That Side the Question,
 “on which he spent so many of his
 “Thoughts, as upon one of his fa-
 “vourite Points.”

It may not be amiss to observe
 here (what, perhaps, will create no
 great Prejudice in Favour of their
 Doctrine) that the Writers against
 the *Immortality* of the Soul seem to
 have copied after *Socinus* and his
 Followers; as we learn from Pro-
 fessor *Herman Witfius*; who delivers
 their Doctrine (from a *Compendiolum*,
 drawn up by the *Socinians* them-
 selves)

selves) in the following Words :
 “ Their Sentiments about the State
 “ of Souls after Death are these :
 “ That Man by Death undergoes
 “ such a total *Dissolution*, as to be al-
 “ together NOTHING: unless that
 “ his Spirit (even as the Spirit of
 “ the *Beasts* (like a kind of Wind
 “ or Breath) returns to God
 “ who gave it, *Eccl.* 12.—because
 “ That Breath or Spirit is a Kind
 “ of *Virtue* or Efficacy of Him, to
 “ whom it returns—moreover they
 “ infer from this, that Souls after
 “ Death have no *Sensation*, nay, do
 “ not indeed actually *subsist* in them-
 “ selves, as Persons do.” *

It is not my Design, in the fol-
 lowing *Defence*, to enter upon a di-
 rect and formal *Proof* of an immaterial
 and naturally-immortal Principle, or
 Soul, in Man. That is already and suf-

* *Witsius's Oeconomy of the Covenants*, London,
 1763. Vol. 2. p. 744.

sufficiently done by a multitude of Writers, both of our own and other Countries; there having been scarce a Philosopher or Divine, of any Note, since the first Publication of the Gospel, who has not borne Testimony to, and *demonstrated*, the Truth of That great, fundamental, Article of all Religion, both Natural and Revealed.

Hence the only Task incumbent on us, is, to guard the *received Doctrine* of the *Human Soul* against the Attacks of its Enemies. This is the Business of the following Pages; and the doing this amounts, in Reality, to a *full Proof* of the Doctrine defended; it being of equal Service to the Cause of Truth, to detect the Fallacy of Arguments brought against it, as to inforce those, which contain the direct and formal Proof of it—as the Safety of a *besieged Town* is effectually provided for,

without taking into Consideration the State of its Fortifications, by driving the Enemy to a Distance, or silencing the Batteries raised against it.

But I flatter myself, I have done more than barely defend the received Doctrine against the Ojections of its Opposers. My Undertaking has given me an Opportunity of explaining the peculiar Benefits and Privileges of the Christian Covenant, by ascertaining the full Meaning and Import of the Terms *Death, Life, and Immortality*, employed by the Writers of the New Testament, to express the true Nature and Ends of the *Christian Redemption*.

It has fallen, likewise, in my Way, to establish the *Necessity* of the *Christian Redemption* upon its true Ground, the Want of those *Means of Salvation* in the *State of Nature*, which peculiarly belong to the

the *State of Grace*—also to explain the true *Extent* of the *Christian Redemption*, by placing it in That *Light*, which alone can perfectly reconcile the (hitherto) *partial Communications* of Christianity with the *Wisdom, Justice, and Goodness* of almighty God in the moral Government of the World.

How I have succeeded in endeavouring to defend the *common Notion* of *Man's Immortality*, must be left to the Judgment of the impartial Reader; to which I willingly submit, not doubting, that the *Necessity and Importance* of the *Subject* will atone in some Measure for the *Defects* of the *Writer*.

It has fallen, likewise, in my Way, to establish the Necessity of the *Christian Redemption* upon its true Ground, the Want of those Means of Salvation in the State of Nature which peculiarly belong to the

C O N-

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECTIONS

I. THE Objections of the three Writers to the commonly-received Doctrine, contained in six Propositions.

II. The First Proposition. Texts alleged in Proof of it. First Argument against the Conclusion, drawn from the First Proposition—*Proves and disproves*, in the words of Greek Writers. Stand for an immaterial Substance. The second Argument—*Body and Soul inseparably united* to denote Man.

III. The Second Proposition. Texts produced in Support of it. These Texts respect the State of the dead Body only. A Digression to the Writings of Cicero—A Passage of his De Senectute quoted—Extracts from his Familiar Epistles—Dr. Middleton and Bishop Warburton both of Opinion, that Cicero disbelieved a Future State—True Meaning of the Passages cited from his Epistles—Cicero, an Exception to Bishop Warburton's general Assertion, that none of the ancient Philosophers believed a Future State—True Case of the Philosophers—They fluctuated between the Belief

CONTENTS

O F

The SECTIONS.

I. **T**HE *Objections of the three Writers to the commonly-received Doctrine, contained in six Propositions.*

II. *The First Proposition. Texts alledged in Proof of it. First Argument against the Conclusion, drawn from the first Proposition—Πνευμα and ψυχη, in the purest Greek Writers, stand for an immaterial Substance. The second Argument—Body and Soul indifferently used to denote Man.*

III. *The Second Proposition. Texts produced in Support of it. These Texts respect the State of the dead Body only. A Digression to the Writings of Cicero—A Passage of his De Senectute quoted—Extracts from his Familiar Epistles—Dr. Middleton and Bishop Warburton Both of Opinion, that Cicero disbelieved a Future State—True Meaning of the Passages cited from his Epistles—Cicero, an Exception to Bishop Warburton's general Assertion, that none of the ancient Philosophers believed a Future State—True Case of the Philosophers—They fluctuated between the
Belief*

Belief and Disbelief of a Future State. Dr. Law's Interpretation of the Sentence pronounced on our first Parents—The Terms of the Sentence conclude nothing against an immaterial Principle—Our first Parents comforted with a Prospect of recovering their lost Immortality. Bp. Sherlock's Interpretation of the Sentence pronounced on the Serpent. Adam might have the Knowledge of an immaterial Principle united with his Body. Our first Parents, probably, ignorant of the Soul's Immortality—Their Notion of the Sentence of Death no Argument against an immaterial Principle.

IV. *The Third Proposition. Texts alledged in Support of it. Dr. Law's Inference from those Texts. No Impropriety in the Scripture's representing Death as immediately followed by Judgment. The Texts, expressing the Coming of Christ as near at Hand, to be understood solely of the Destruction of Jerusalem. A Reflection of Luther's on the Death of John, Elector of Saxony.*

V. *The Fourth Proposition. Select Passages of the New Testament, viz. 1. Matt. x. 28. Dr. Law's Comment—absurd, supposing Life and Soul to mean the same Thing. True Meaning of our Saviour's Words. 2. Luke xx. 38. Dr. Law's Comment. Bp. Warburton's Interpretation of That Text—A Sneer on That Interpretation—The Doctrine of the Sadducees explained, and the Bishop's Interpretation established. 3. Acts vii. 59. Dr. Law's Comment—makes St. Stephen's Prayer Nonsense. 4. 2 Cor. vi. 8. Dr. Law's Comment—upon the Principle of no Soul, makes St. Paul's Words complete Nonsense.*

VI. *The*

VI. *The Fifth Proposition or Objection to the commonly-received Doctrine. Dr. Law's Account of the Scripture Doctrine of Immortality—Dr. Taylor of Norwich, cited by Dr. Law—the latter's Representation of the common Doctrine. The Scripture Doctrine of Immortality, according to the Author of the Short Historical View, &c. The natural Mortality of the Soul asserted by the Author of Universal Restitution, &c. The Scriptures silent as to the natural Immortality of the Soul—Appeal to Archbishop Tillotson—His Grace vindicated—yet censured for granting too much. Instances of the Scripture's speaking agreeably to vulgar Prejudice.*

VII. *The true Scripture Doctrine of Man's Immortality. The capital Text—includes the peculiar Privileges of the Christian Covenant—Bp. Sherlock quoted, and censured. The Words Death and Life metaphorically used for the State of Sin and the State of Righteousness. The Author of Universal Restitution confuted—Difference between the Immortality of God and That of Angels and Human Souls. The Mortality of the Soul not held by the primitive Fathers, but the contrary—Citations from Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Lactantius. Mr. Law's strange Hypothesis. The Words Death and Life used to denote the Punishment of the Wicked and the Reward of the Righteous—An Objection answered. Life and Immortality, in the Scripture Sense, the Gift of God thro' Jesus Christ—This Doctrine perfectly consistent with an immaterial Principle in Man.*

VIII. *Objection to natural Immortality, That it vacates all Use and Necessity of the Christian Redemption. The Objection in what grounded. A wide Dif-*

D

ference

ference (natural Immortality supposed) between the State of Nature and the State of Grace. What that Difference is. Necessity of a particular Revelation and a particular Mediator. The State of Nature represented by the Word Perish. A Difficulty, viz. How to reconcile the State of Nature with the Doctrine of future Rewards and Punishments. Solution. The Benefits of the Christian Covenant distinguished into those respecting this Life, and those respecting the next—The Universality of the Christian Redemption, with respect to the next World, a Scripture Doctrine. The Patriarchs &c. interested in the Christian Redemption. Criticism on Gal. iii. 8. Tremellius's Latin Translation of the old Syriac Version of the New Testament recommended—Its singular Use. The Revelation of the Christian Redemption to the Patriarchs, a Proof, that their Posterity must have had the Knowledge of a Future State—Bp. Warburton's Proof, that they had not—answered—The same Conclusion drawn from another of the Bishop's Concessions. Clemens Romanus quoted—Account of That Author, and his first Epistle to the Corinthians. The Universality of the Christian Salvation proved. A Passage of Seed's Sermons quoted. All Mankind in a State of Grace. The Deists effectually dislodged from their Strong-Holds. The Advocates of Christianity able to defend it, without giving up the immaterial Principle.

IX. Objection, That the Pietists build their several Systems on the Foundation of Two Natures in Man—There may, nevertheless, be two Natures in Man. The Doctrine of Grace one Proof of a Spiritual Substance in Man. The Christian Privilege of Grace discarded by the Author of the Short Historical View.

X. Dr. Law's heavy Charge against the Christian World in general, and Advice to change our Posture of Defence. His Counsel rejected, because, by following it, we should supply the Deists with still stronger Arguments against the Christian Religion. Deistical Objections, founded in the Denial of an immaterial Principle. 1. It contradicts a plain Dictate of Reason and Nature. 2. It takes away all reasonable Ground of Religion in Heathen Countries. 3. It leaves no Way of vindicating the Wisdom, Justice, and Goodness of God, in the Government of the Moral World. Impossible, upon the Foot of no immaterial Principle, to convert one reasonable, thinking, Deist. The Soul's natural Immortality, a Doctrine supported both by Scripture and the general Consent of Mankind in all Ages and Nations of the World.

IX. The Historian's Plea for Indulgence, in opposing the common Doctrine. No Decision of the Controversy in the Thirty-nine Articles. The Fortieth of K. Edward's Articles, against the Sleep of the Soul—this Article dropped—the true Reason, why. The common Doctrine of the Human Soul, the Doctrine of our Liturgy, particularly in the Office of the Burial of the Dead—On what Account That Office wants Correction. The Church of England clearly on our Side.

XII. Importance of defending the common Doctrine. Opposite Ideas of Man. A Query. New Language in Divinity. Necessity of another Review of our Liturgy. All our Books of Religion and Morality heretical. The Objectors cautioned.

POSTSCRIPT. Six Philosophical Arguments or Objections of Dr. Coward and Mr. Dodwell, answered.

A
D E F E N C E
OF THE
Commonly-received Doctrine
OF THE
HUMAN SOUL, &c.

SECTION I.

FOR the sake of Method, and to give the Reader a comprehensive View of the Points in Debate, I have thought it most convenient to draw up the Objections of the three Writers, I have undertaken to answer, in the Form of Propositions, and to range them in the following Order.

PROPOSITION I.

The Words Soul or Spirit (in Hebrew נֶפֶשׁ, in Greek πνεῦμα, ψυχή) are never used, in holy-Scripture, to denote an Immortal Principle or Substance.

A

D E F E N C E

OF THE

Commonly-received Doctrine

OF THE

H U M A N S O U L, &c.

SECTION I.

✠✠✠ FOR the Sake of Method, and to
✠ F ✠ give the Reader a comprehen-
✠✠✠ sive View of the Points in De-
bate, I have thought it most convenient
to draw up the *Objections* of the three
Writers, I have undertaken to answer,
in the Form of PROPOSITIONS, and to
range them in the following Order.

PROPOSITION I.

The Words SOUL or SPIRIT (in He-
brew נֶפֶשׁ, נְשָׁמָה, רוּחַ, in Greek πνεῦμα, ψυχή)
are never used, in holy Scripture, to
denote an *Immaterial Principle or Substance*
in

in Man, wholly separable from, and independent on, his *Body*.

PROPOSITION II.

The State, to which **DEATH** reduces us, is represented in Scripture as a State of absolute *Insensibility*, a total *Privation* of *Life* and *Consciousness*, or an utter *Extinction* of *Being*.

PROPOSITION III.

The *Restoration* of *Life* and *Consciousness* to the Dead will not take Place 'till the *Resurrection*.

PROPOSITION IV.

The *Texts* of Scripture, alledged to prove the *Separate Existence* of the *Soul*, prove no such Thing.

PROPOSITION V.

That *Immortality* of Man, of which the Scriptures speak, is not a *Natural Immortality*, but the *Gift* of God thro' *Jesus Christ*.

PRO-

PROPOSITION VI.

The Doctrine of *Natural Immortality* vacates all Use and Necessity of the *Christian Redemption*.

Could the Truth of these Propositions, taken together, be clearly made out, it would, indeed, follow, that there is, really, no such Thing as an *immaterial* and *naturally-immortal* Principle or Soul in Man; but that, when we die, we die *All, ** and entirely *cease to be*, till the last Trumpet shall sound, and the Dead shall be raised. †

But I hope to shew, that the Truth of these Propositions cannot be established in such a Sense, as to overthrow the *commonly-received Opinion*.

SECTION

* Horace could say,

*Non Omnis moriar; magnaque Pars mei
Vitabit Libitinam.*

Carm. lib. 3. Od. 30. v. 16.
which, tho' he only meant by it, that his Works should survive him, may be justly and beautifully applied to express the Survivorship of the Human Soul.

† 1 Cor. xv. 52.

SECTION II.

THE FIRST PROPOSITION is: The Words SOUL or SPIRIT (in Hebrew נַפֶּשׁ, רוּחַ; in Greek, πνεῦμα, ψύχη) are never used, in holy Scripture, to denote an immaterial Principle or Substance in Man, wholly separable from, and independent on, his Body.

To prove This, Dr. Law * has given us a large Collection of Scriptures, to shew, that the Words in Question most commonly denote, either PERSONS, as, *That Soul shall be cut off*, Gen. xvii. 14. or, PEOPLE, as, *All the Souls of his Sons and Daughters were thirty and three*, Gen. xlvii. 15. or, the MAN HIMSELF, as, *That my Soul may bless thee before I die*, Gen. xxvii. 4. Again, Souls are said to be *made fat*, to be *hungry*, &c. *Exod. xii. 16. Prov. xi. 25. Psal. cvii. 9.* Sometimes, the Words stand for the Body alone, as, *His Soul draweth near unto the Grave*, *Job xxxiii. 22.* and sometimes for Life, as, *In whose Hand is the Soul of every living Thing*,

* Appendix to the Considerations on the Theory of Religion. p. 361—381.

Thing, and the Breath of all Mankind, Job xxvii. 8. Sometimes, the Words denote the lower Appetites or Passions of the Mind, as, His Soul clave unto Dinah, Gen. xli. 8. and sometimes the superior Faculties, as, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, and with all thy Soul, and with all thy Mind.

It may be granted, that, in these and all the other Texts produced by the Master of Peter-House, the Word Soul does not stand for That Part of Man, which, in common Speech, is denoted by That Word. But it cannot be concluded from thence (as the learned Writer would have us conclude) that there is no immaterial Principle or Substance in Man, distinct from his Bodily Frame; and that for the two following Reasons.

First, I lay it down for an undeniable Truth, that the Greek Translators of the Hebrew Scriptures employed such Words, as conveyed to the Mind, as nearly as possible, the very same Ideas as the Hebrew; and, consequently, that the doubtful

Meaning of an *Hebrew Expression* may safely be determined by the *certain Sense* of the *Greek Version*. Now, it is certain, that the *Greek Words* Πνεῦμα and ψυχή, used by the *Septuagint*, and other *Greek Translators*, to express the *Sense* of the *Hebrew Words* *Nephesh*, *Neshama*, and *Ruah*, signify, in the best and purest *Writers of Antiquity*, a *Spiritual Substance* in *Man*, *distinct* from his *Body*.*

And

* *Plato* defines *Death* to be, A *Separation* of the *Soul* from the *Body*, and the *distinct Existence* of *Each* in *That State* of *Separation*. Ἡγούμαι δὲ τι

τὸν θάνατον εἶναι ; πανευγ', ἔφη ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Σιμμία. Ἄρα μὴ ἄλλο τι ἢ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλαγὴν ; καὶ εἶναι τὸτο τεθνάναι, χωρὶς μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαλλαγέν, αὐτὸ καὶ ἑαυτὸ τὸ σῶμα γεγονέναι. χωρὶς δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλαγέναι, αὐτὴν καὶ αὐτὴν εἶναι ; Ἄρα μὴ ἄλλο τι ἢ ὁ θάνατος ἢ τὸτο ; Οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τὸτο, ἔφη. And he describes the *Difference* between the *Soul* (ψυχή) and the *Body* (σῶμα) by their *opposite Natures* or *Qualities*. The former, he tells us, is *Divine*, *Immortal*, *Intelligent*, *Simple*, *Indissoluble*, and *Always the same*; but the latter the very *Reverse*, in every one of these *Particulars*.

Σκόπει δὲ, ἔφη, ὃ κίβης, εἰ ἐκ πάντων τῶν εἰρημένων τάδε ἡμῖν συμβαίνει. τῷ μὲν θεῷ καὶ ἀθανάτῳ καὶ νοητῷ καὶ μονοειδῇ καὶ ἀδιαλύτῳ καὶ αἰῶσαύτως καὶ κατὰ ταυτὰ ἔχοντι ἑαυτῷ, ὁμοιότατον εἶναι ψυχὴν. τῷ δ' ἀνθρωπίνῳ καὶ θνητῷ καὶ ἀνοήτῳ καὶ πολυειδῇ καὶ διαλυτῷ καὶ μηδέποτε κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ἔχοντι

And it is unreasonable to suppose, they lose their proper Signification, when used by the inspired Pen-men. On the contrary, it is certain, they do not. For, of the supreme Being St. *John* says, Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός, *God is a Spirit.* † And, surely, God is, in the most eminent Sense, a *Spiritual, Incorporeal, or Immaterial, Being.* Whence it follows, that *Nepheesh, Neshama, Ruah,* or any other Word in the *Hebrew Language*, rendered by the *Greek Word Πνεῦμα*, carries with it, in its original and proper Signification, the Idea of an *immaterial Substance.* And the same may be said of the *Hebrew Word* or Words translated by the *Greek ψυχή.* Observe, that I speak here only of the *primary or abstract Signification* of the Words, without any Consideration of their *Use* in This or That particular Sentence. And I must be allowed to think, that, if, taken apart, and unconnected

E 2

ταῦτα, ὁμοίωτάτον αὐτῷ εἶναι σημα. ΦΑΙΔΟΝ, Η ΠΕΡΙ
 ΨΥΧΗΣ. ap. ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΔΙΑΛΟΓΟΙ Ε. recens.
Nath. Forster &c. Oxon. 1745. p. 173, 215.

† *John iv. 24.*

connected with other Words, they stand for an *immaterial* Substance, no *figurative* or *borrowed* Use of them can so far alter their Sense, as to exclude from it the Idea of *Immateriality*.

Secondly, it will by no Means follow, that, because the Words *Soul* and *Spirit* are used in holy Scripture to denote *Persons*, *People*, or the *Man himself*, therefore *Man* is not a Being compounded of two Parts, *Matter* and *Spirit*, or *Body* and *Soul*. For, allowing him to be such a compound Being, he may, properly enough, be denoted by *either* Part of his Composition Alone. Thus, in common Discourse, we use the Words *Body* and *Soul* promiscuously. We say of an unhappy Person, *poor Soul!* of a large Town or City, it contains so many *thousand Souls*; and when a Ship is cast away, and none escape, we say indifferently, *every Body* or *every Soul* perished; without intending to confine the Idea of *Man* to That of a merely corporeal or merely spiritual Being. And, if *Man* may be properly denoted by *either* Part

Part of his Composition, it is not much to be wondered at, that the sacred Writers should most commonly use the *nobler* of the two, as That, which most eminently distinguishes *Man* from the rest of the *Animal* Creation.

SECTION III.

THE SECOND PROPOSITION is: The State, to which DEATH reduces us, is represented in Scripture as a State of absolute *Insensibility*, a total *Privation* of *Life* and *Consciousness*, or an utter *Extinction* of *Being*.

To prove this, the learned *Master* of *Peter-House* * has thrown together a great Variety of Texts, in which the State of Death is represented by, (1.) *Sleep*; as, *The Lord said unto Moses, Thou shalt sleep with thy Fathers. Deut. xxxi. 16. Many of them that sleep in the Dust of the Earth shall awake. Dan. xii. 2.* (2.) A Negation of all *Thought*, *Life*, or *Action*; as, *His Breath goeth forth, he returneth to his Earth, in That very Day his Thoughts perish. Psal. cxlvi.*

* *Ubi supra.* p. 381—387.

cxlvii. 4. There is no Work, nor Device,
 nor Knowledge, nor Wisdom, in the Grave,
 whither thou goest. Eccl. ix. 10. (3.) A
 Rest or Home; as, There the Weary be at
 rest. Job iii. 17. Man goeth to his long
 Home. Eccl. ix. 10. (4.) Silence; as, He will
 keep the Feet of his Saints, and the Wicked
 shall be silent in Darkness. 1 Sam. ii. 9.
 Unless the Lord had been my Help, my Soul
 had almost dwelt in Silence. Psal. xxxi. 17.
 (5.) Oblivion; as, In Death there is no Re-
 membrance of thee. Psal. vi. 5. Shall thy
 Wonders be known in the Dark, and thy
 Righteousness in the Land of Forgetfulness?
 Psal. lxxxviii. 12. (6.) Darkness; as, Be-
 fore I go to the Land of Darkness, and the
 Shadow of Death. Job x. 21. The Grave is
 mine house, I have made my Bed in Dark-
 ness. Job xviii. 19. (7.) Corruption and
 Destruction; as, Thou wilt not suffer thine
 Holy One to see Corruption. Psal. xvi. 10.
 Destruction and Death say, We have heard
 the Fame thereof. Job xxviii. 22, &c. &c.
 But, how do these Scriptures prove
 against the Union of an immaterial Prin-
 ciple with the Body of living Man, or
 its

its separate Existence after Death? They are plain Representations of That State only, to which the *Body* is reduced by Death. The dead *Body sleeps*; is deprived of all *Life, Thought, and Action*; is at *Rest*, and (as we commonly say) *gone to its long Home*; is in a State of *Silence, Oblivion, and Darkness*; and suffers *Corruption or Putrefaction* in the *Grave*, till it be entirely *destroyed* as a material System or *Body*. But, all this notwithstanding, there may have been a *Spiritual Substance* united with the *Body* before its *Death*, and subsisting separately after it. And therefore the sacred Writers, in thus representing the State of *Death*, cannot fairly be understood to *deny* either the *Existence* or *separate Existence* of the *Human Soul*.

The Reader will excuse a *Digression*, in this Place, from the sacred Writings to those of the great *Roman Orator and Philosopher*, as it tends to confirm what I take to be the true Interpretation of the foregoing Scriptures.

None

None of the Heathen Philosophers have expressed their Belief of a *Future State* in stronger Terms than *Cicero*. It is no easy Matter, indeed, to come at his *real* Sentiments in his *Philosophical Works*; in which he personates the Stoic, the Epicurean, the Academic, &c. by Turns; and, consequently, delivers *their* Opinions rather than his own. But in his Treatise of *Old Age* (a Piece of the *Moral Kind*) he expressly tells us, he speaks his *own* Mind in the Character of *Cato the Elder*. * Now, in That Piece, our Orator and Philosopher speaks with great Confidence, and even Rapture, of a Future State. "I see not" (says he, addressing himself to *Scipio* and *Lælius*) "why I may not declare to you my Thoughts concerning Death; and perhaps, I may discern better than others what it is, as by Reason of my Age I am not far from it. I am firmly persuaded, that your Fathers, eminent Persons and my particular Friends, are

* *Jam ipseus Catonis Sermo explicabit nostram omnem de Senectute Sententiam. Cic. De Senect. c. 1.*

" are still living, and live the Life,
 " which alone deserves the Name of
 " Life—In which Belief I am confirmed,
 " not only by Reason and Argument,
 " but by the Authority of the greatest
 " Philosophers—O glorious Day, when
 " I shall quit this troubled and filthy
 " Scene of Things, and go to join the
 " Divine Council and Assembly of Spi-
 " rits!—But, if I err, in believing that
 " the Souls of Men are immortal, I wil-
 " lingly err; nor will I suffer so pleasing
 " a Mistake to be extorted from me so
 " long as I live." *

And yet, notwithstanding this strong
 Attestation to the Doctrine of a *Future*
 F *State,*

* *Equidem non video, cur quid ipse sentiam de Morte non audeam vobis dicere: quod eo melius mihi cernere videor, quo ab eo propius absum. Ego vestros Patres, viros clarissimos mihiq̃ue amicissimos, vivere arbitror, et eam quidem Vitam, quæ est sola Vita nominanda—nec me solum Ratio ac Disputatio impulit ut ita crederem, sed Nobilitas etiam summorum Philosophorum et Aucto-ritas—O præclarum Diem, cum ad illud Divinum Concilium Cætumque profisciscar; cumque ex hac Turba et Colluvione discedam!—Quod si in hoc erro, quod Animos Hominum immortales esse credam, lubenter erro; nec mihi hunc errorem, quo delector, dum vivo, extorqueri volo. Ib. c. 21. & 23.*

State, Cicero, in some of his *Familiar Letters* (where, likewise, one might expect to find his *real Sentiments*) seems to declare *against* a Future State. Thus, to *Lucius Mestonius* he says: "As I have behaved with Moderation in Prosperity, so ought I to submit with Courage and Resolution to the present adverse and ruined State of Affairs; that I may reap this Advantage at least from such great Evils, to learn from them, not only to despise Death (which the happiest ought to do) but even to wish for it, because it *puts an End to all Thought and Reflection.*" To his Friend *Toranius*, he says: "Since there is no Remedy, the only Thing left us is, to submit patiently to whatever happens, considering that Death

† Ut illa secunda moderatè tulimus, sic hanc non so-
lum adversam sed funditus eversam Fortunam ferre de-
bemus; ut hoc Iakem in maximis malis boni consequamur,
ut Mortem, quam etiam beati contemnere debe-
mus, propterea quod nullum Sensum esset habitura,
nunc sic affecti non modo contemnere debeamus, sed
etiam optare. Epist. ad Famil. l. 5. ep. 21.

"puts an End to all Things." † And (to mention no more) to *Torquatus* he says:
 "No wise Man ever pretended, that
 "Death is an Evil, even to the happy
 "—But this is small Comfort: There is
 "another Consideration much more
 "comfortable, which I hope you make
 "Use of, as I certainly do; and it is
 "this: While I live, nothing shall dis-
 "turb me, because I have a clear Con-
 "science; and when I cease to live, I
 "shall lose all Sense and Knowledge of
 "Things." §

Dr. Middleton, in his *Life of Cicero*,
 and Bishop Warburton, in his *Divine
 Legation of Moses*, Both understand
 these Passages of the Roman Philoso-
 pher, and others to the same Effect, as
 a Denial of a Future State. Which the

F 2

Doctor

† Cum Consilio profici nihil possit, una Ratio videtur,
 quicquid evenerit, ferre moderate, cum omnium Re-
 rum Mors sit extremum. Ib. l. 6. ep. 21.

§ Mori autem nemo sapiens miserum dixit, ne beato
 quidem—sed hæc Consolatio levis est; illa gravior, quæ
 te uti spero, ego certe ulor: nec enim dum ero, angar
 ulla re, cum omni vacem Culpa; et si non ero, Sensu
 omnino carebo. Ib. ep. 3.

Doctor endeavours to account for, by
 ascribing *Cicero's* present Thoughts to the
 melancholy State of his Mind and De-
 jection of his Spirits, when he wrote
 them, viz. When all Things went wrong
 with him, and *Cæsar's* Power was at its
 Height: "at which Time" (says our Bi-
 ographer) "the same Arguments would
 " not appear to him with the same Force,
 " but Doubts and Difficulties get the
 " Ascendant, and what humoured his
 " present Chagrin find the readiest Ad-
 " mission" || The learned Prelate justly
 objects to this Solution, that the melan-
 choly Situation, *Cicero* found himself in,
 tended rather to strengthen his Belief of
 a Future State: "And This" (says he)
 " by the wise and gracious Disposition
 " of Nature, that the Mind may endea-
 " your to make up, by Abundance of
 " Hope in one Quarter, what, thro' the
 " Persuasion of its Fears, it hath suffered
 " itself to part with in another." But,
 notwithstanding this natural Effect of
Cicero's present Situation, "Philosophy"
 (his Lordship asserts) would not "per-
 " mit

"mit him to entertain any Hopes at all
 "of a future Good: and therefore, as,
 in those Letters, he must be supposed to
 "deliver his real Sentiments," we have
Cicero "professing his Disbelief of a fu-
 "ture State of Rewards and Punish-
 "ments in the frankest and freest Man-
 "ner."

But, with all due Deference to the
 superior Judgment of these learned
 Writers, I cannot think, that these or a
 hundred more such Passages amount to
 a Denial of a Future State. There are
 two Lights, in which *Death* may be
 viewed. It may be considered either
 as the *End* of the present Life, or the
Beginning of the next. *Cicero* plainly
 considers *Death* in the former Light
 only. He had before his Eyes the me-
 lancholy Situation of public Affairs, and
 comforts himself with the Prospect of
 being soon removed from all farther
 Concern with them. *Cæsar* might op-
 press and destroy the Liberties of the
 Roman Commonwealth: But *Cicero*, laid
 in

in his Grave, would have no Sense or Knowledge of what passed in the World, nor be disturbed with any Thought or Reflection on the Miseries of his Country.

This appears to me to be Cicero's Meaning in the above-cited Passages; and it is remarkable, that Job, under his Afflictions, considers Death in the same Light that Cicero does: For, There (says he) the Wicked cease from troubling; and there the Weary be at Rest: There the Prisoners rest together; they hear not the Voice of the Oppressor.* But, to speak thus is

neither to affirm, nor deny, a Future State. It is only considering Death as a Release from worldly Misery; which it effectually is, by reducing us to a State of absolute Insensibility with Respect to the Things of this World.

If I have justly interpreted Cicero's Words, † I cannot but think, that, by the

* Job iii. 17, 18.

† By the Way, if my Interpretation of Cicero's Words be admitted, That great Philosopher will be an Exception to Bp. Warburton's General Assertion (Div. Leg. Book 3. Sections 1—3.) that None of the ancient Philosophers believed, or could possibly believe, a future State of Rewards and

the same Way of Interpretation, we may as justly reconcile Dr. Law's Collection

Punishments; since his Lordship lays the chief Stress of his Proof, with Respect to *Cicero*, on those very Passages of his *Letters*, which I have explained to another Sense. Indeed, were these Passages never so (*seemingly*) declarative of *Cicero's* Disbelief of a Future State, the Argument, drawn from them, would be greatly weakened, if not entirely destroyed, by That *positive* Assertion of his Belief, in a Piece, wherein he expressly tells us, he "speaks his own Mind in the Character of *Cato*." Which I take to be a stronger Evidence of his *Sincerity*, than the bare *Presumption*, that, in his *Familiar Letters*, he delivers his *real Sentiments*. And it is worth our Observation, that, in the celebrated Passage above-cited from his *De Senectute*, *Cicero* declares, he was "confirmed in" his "Belief" of a Future State, "not only by Reason and Argument, but by the Authority of the greatest *Philosophers*." A Demonstration, that he thought, the ancient Sages of *Greece*, from whose Writings he drew all his Philosophy, had fully proved the Doctrine of a Future State. And, that he meant a Future State of Reward or Happiness for good Men, is evident from the Terms, in which he expresses it; declaring it to be his firm Persuasion, that they not only "live" after Death, but "live the Life, which alone deserves the Name of 'Life'."

It is not my Business or Design to engage in this Part of the Controversy between the Author

lection of Scriptures, relating to the
State of Death, with the Doctrine of the
 Sur-

of the *Divine Legation* and his Opponents, any farther, than to lay before the Reader what I take to be the *true Case* of the antient *Philosophers*, with Respect to the Belief or Disbelief of a Future State; and it is This.

When they undertook to urge and enforce the *Moral Evidence* of a Future State, in order to convince Mankind of the Truth of a Doctrine, so necessary to the Support of Religion, and, consequently, of Civil Society, they really *believed it themselves*; being as firmly persuaded of it, as *Plato* was of the *Soul's Eternity* or *Immortality*; for the Truth of which (*Cicero* tells us) *tot Rationes attulit, ut velle cæteris, sibi certè persuasisse videatur*. *Tusc. Disp. l. 1. c. 17, 21.* "he brought so many " Arguments, that he seems desirous to convince " others, and was certainly himself convinced " of it." And, indeed, when we read *Plato's Phædon* or *Cicero's De Senectute*, and find those excellent Writers delivering the Doctrine of the *Soul's Immortality* and a *Future State*, with all That Seriousness, Warmth of Expression, and even Rapture, which naturally accompany a thorough Conviction of Truth, how can we suppose, they were not in Earnest, but taught others for Truth what they themselves were persuaded was false?

But these very Philosophers, when engaged in refined and *metaphysical* Disquisitions on the Nature of God and of the *Human Soul*, were unhappily led to such Conclusions, as they found to

Survivorship and Immortality of the Human Soul.

G

But,

be absolutely inconsistent with the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. In these Speculations it is that we find the Philosophers *denying* a Future State, either by positive Assertions, or manifest Indications, of their Disbelief.

To think of reconciling the antient Philosophers with themselves, by endeavouring to prove, either that they *always* believed a future State of Rewards and Punishments, or that they *never* believed it, appears to me to be Labour in vain; it being evident, that they *fluctuated* between the Belief and Disbelief of Another Life, according as their Minds were employed on Moral or Metaphysical Considerations. On which Account, with all their Learning and extraordinary Abilities, their Writings must be considered as a melancholy Instance of the *Wanderings* of the Human Mind, and a striking Proof of the Weakness and Insufficiency of *unassisted Human Reason*; thro' which the wisest and learnedest of the Hea-then World were betrayed into such Self-Contradictions and Inconsistencies; as are the *Opprobrium*, the Shame and Disgrace, of a Rational Creature; and which justly exposed them to the severest Censure from the great Apostle of the *Gentiles*, who treats (not Human Learning in general, but) the Learning and Philosophy of the *Greeks* as no better than *Vain Babblings and Oppositions of Science falsely so called*, τὰς βεβήλους κενόφωνας, καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως. 2 Tim. vi. 20.

But, to return from this Digression;
 That we may omit nothing advanced
 by the *Master of Peter-House*, to deter-
 mine the true Scripture Sense of the
Word Death, let us attend to what he
 says of the *Sentence of Death*, pronounced
 on *Adam*, and, in Him, on his whole
Posterity; viz. *In the Day that thou eatest
 thereof (of the Tree of the Knowledge of
 Good and Evil) thou shalt surely die,* * and
 again,

Where we see, in one of its strongest Lights, the
 Necessity of Divine Revelation, not only as a
 Remedy of the Corruption and Depravity of
 Human Will, but as a Cure of the Ravings, and
 an Help to the Inability, of Human Reason, by
 extricating it from the Perplexities and Intangle-
 ments of a vain and self-contradictory Philoso-
 phy, and establishing the great Truths of Nature
 upon the clearest and most indisputable Princi-
 ples, and the Foundation of absolute Certainty
 itself.

* *Gen. ii. 17.* The Original is *מוֹת תָּמוּת*
dying thou shalt die; Which *Dr. Law* would have
 rendered, *Thou shalt utterly die*; and refers to
Bp. Patrick on the Place, telling us, that "*Atha-*
nasius thinks, the doubling the Expression de-
 notes *Μη μόνον αποθνήσκειν, αλλά και εν τῇ τῷ θανάτῳ*
χρῆσσι διαμένειν (*Le de Incarn. Verbi*) he should
 not only die, but remain in the Corruption of
 Death; as we should all have done, had not

again, *In the Sweat of thy Face shalt thou eat Bread, 'till thou return unto the Ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for Dust thou art, and unto Dust shalt thou return.*†

“Now, What” (says the learned Writer)
 “do we imagine they (our *first Parents*)
 “could possibly understand by this, but
 “a Resumption of That *Life* or consci-
 “ous *Being*, which their Creator had
 “been lately pleased to bestow upon
 “them? The forfeiting which must ne-
 “cessarily include a total Loss of all those
 “Benefits, that then did, or ever could
 “proceed from him. This surely, and
 “nothing less, must be implied in That
 “most solemn Sentence; Nor can we
 “well conceive the unhappy Subjects
 “of it to have been at that Time so very
 “ingenious, as to explain it all away,
 “by distinguishing upon the different
 “Parts of their Constitution; and so
 “con-

“the Second Adam obtained for us an happy
 “Resurrection.” But the Truth is, the *Redup-
 lication* is a mere *Hebraism*, very common with
 the Sacred Writers; and adds nothing to what
 we are to understand by the Word *Dying*.

† Gen. iii. 19.

concluding, that by Death no more
 was intended than only *living* in some
 different Manner, or a Continuation
 of their Consciousness and real Exist-
 ence in some other Place. No: That
 was the Philosophy of After-ages." †
 This Interpretation is necessarily con-
 nected with the Doctrine of *no immaterial*
Principle in Man; which whoever asserts
 must hold, that the Sentence pro-
 nounced upon our first Parents im-
 ported a total Deprivation of Life,
 without any Reserve or Saving to the
 Life of the Soul." §

All that is incumbent on me here, is
 to shew, that nothing can be fairly con-
 cluded, either from the *Terms* of the
 Sentence pronounced on our first Pa-
 rents, or the *Sense* in which Dr. Law
 supposes they must have understood it,
 against the Existence and Survivorship
 of the Human Soul.

Adam

† *The Nature and End of Death under the Christian*
Covenant, subjoined to Dr. Law's *Considerations* &c.

§ *Short Historical View* &c. p. 27.

Adam was created to be immortal, that is, never to taste Death. This is evident from hence, that Death was the Penalty annexed to Adam's Disobedience: *In the Day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.* But, what was That Immortality Adam was created to have? Tenjoyed? The Writers, I am contending with, will readily allow, it was That of his Body. The Punishment, therefore, of Adam's Transgression, by Death, was, The Dissolution of his Bodily Frame: *Dust thou art, and unto Dust shalt thou return.* So far we are agreed. But, by what Rule of Logic will it follow, that, because the Body of Adam was to return to the Dust, out of which it was taken, therefore his Body was the Whole of his Composition as a Man? Might there not, notwithstanding the Forfeiture of Bodily Immortality, be an immaterial Principle united with the living Body of Adam? And, if this be no absurd or contradictory Supposition, might there not, in the Sentence pronounced on our first Parents, be a "Reserve or Saving"

ving" (in the Divine Intention) "to the Life of the Soul?" Surely there might. The Argument, therefore, from the Terms of the Sentence, appears to be altogether inconclusive.

But our first Parents (we are told) could not possibly understand, by the Sentence of Death pronounced upon them, any thing but "a Resumption of "That *Life* or conscious *Being*, which "their Creator had been lately pleased "to bestow upon them; the forfeiting "which must necessarily include a total "Loss of all those Benefits, that then "did, or ever could proceed from "him."

That our first Parents understood the threatened *Death* to import a *Dissolution* of their *Bodily Frame*, is evident from the plain Meaning of the Words, in which it was conveyed. But, that they must necessarily have understood it as implying a *total* and *irrecoverable Extinction* of *Being*, may be denied. For God had graciously condescended to comfort the afflicted Pair, by That *first* of all

all the Scripture *Prophecies*, which is a Part of the Sentence pronounced on their Deceiver the Serpent: *I will put Enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed: It shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise his Heel.**

The least we can suppose the Almighty to have intimated to our first Parents, by this Prediction (obscure as it was) is, that their Posterity, or some one or more of them, should, in some future Age, gain such a Victory over their Deceiver, as should *remedy* all the *Evils*, and *repair* all the *Losses*, occasioned by their *Fall*.† Now, as the immediate
and

* Gen. iii. 15.

† The Reader will be pleased to see this Argument drawn out more at Length by the masterly Pen of the late excellent Bishop Sherlock. “ They (our first Parents) were now in a State
“ of Sin, standing before God to receive Sen-
“ tence for their Disobedience, and had Reason
“ to expect a full Execution of the Penalty
“ threatened, *In the Day that thou eatest thereof, thou*
“ *shalt surely die.* But God came in Mercy as well
“ as Judgment, purposing not only to punish,
“ but to restore Man. ——— If God intended
“ to preserve them as Objects of Mercy, it was
“ absolutely necessary to communicate so much

and most sensible Effect of their Disobedience to the Divine Command was, the

“ *Hope* to them, as might be a *rational Foundation*
 “ for their future Endeavours to reconcile themselves to him by a better Obedience——The
 “ Prophecy is excellently adapted to this Purpose, and manifestly conveyed such Hopes to
 “ our first Parents. For let us consider in what
 “ Sense we may suppose them to understand this
 “ Prophecy. Now they must necessarily understand the Prophecy, either according to the
 “ literal Meaning of the Words, or according to
 “ such Meaning as the whole Circumstance of
 “ the Transaction, of which they are a Part, does
 “ require. If we suppose them to understand
 “ the Words literally, and that God meant them
 “ so to be understood, this Passage must appear
 “ ridiculous. Do but imagine that you see God
 “ coming to judge the Offenders; *Adam* and *Eve*
 “ before him in the utmost Distress; that you
 “ hear God inflicting Pains and Sorrows and Misery and Death upon the first of the Human
 “ Race; and that in the midst of all this Scene
 “ of Woe and great Calamity, you hear God
 “ foretelling with great Solemnity a very *trivial*
 “ Accident, that should sometimes happen in
 “ the World: That Serpents would be apt to
 “ bite Men by the Heels, and that Men would
 “ be apt to revenge themselves by striking them
 “ on the Head. What has this *Trifle* to do with
 “ the Loss of Mankind, with the Corruption of

the *Loss of Immortality*, here was a Prospect set before their eyes of *recovering* That *Immortality*, at some Time or other,

H and

“ the natural and moral World, and the Ruin
 “ of all the Glory and Happiness of the Creation?—Leaving this therefore as absolutely
 “ absurd and ridiculous, let us consider what
 “ meaning the circumstances of the Transaction
 “ do necessarily fix to the Words of this Prophecy.—It was necessary to give them (our
 first parents) “ such Hopes as might make them
 “ capable of Religion towards God. These
 “ Hopes they could not but conceive, when they
 “ heard from the Mouth of God, that the Serpent’s Victory was not a complete Victory—
 “ that they and their Posterity should be enabled
 “ to contest his Empire; and that, though they
 “ were to suffer much in the Struggle, yet finally
 “ they should prevail, and bruise the Serpent’s
 “ Head, and deliver themselves from his Power
 “ and Dominion over them. What now could
 “ they conceive this Conquest over Satan to
 “ mean? Is it not natural to expect, that we shall
 “ recover That by Victory, which we lost by being
 “ defeated? They knew that the Enemy had
 “ subdued them by Sin: Could they then conceive
 “ Hopes of Victory otherwise than by Righteousness? They lost thro’ Sin the *Happiness* of
 “ their Creation: Could they expect less from
 “ the Return of Righteousness than the *Recovery*
 “ of the *Blessings forfeited*? *Use and Intent of Prophecy, &c.* 3d ed. p. 60—64.

and by some means or other. So that, by laying together the several Circumstances in the History of the *Fall*, and particularly considering the Sentence pronounced on the Serpent, *together* with That pronounced on *Adam*, it is rendered highly probable, that our first Parents were not left to the gloomy Prospect of *Annihilation*, or "a total Loss of all those Benefits, that then did, or ever could, proceed from their Creator," but had a comfortable Assurance of their Restoration to That "Life and conscious Being" they had "forfeited" by their Fall.

But Dr. *Law* adds: "Nor can we well conceive the unhappy Subjects of it" (the Sentence of Death) "to have been at That Time so very ingenious as to explain it all away by distinguishing upon the different Parts of their Constitution; and so concluding, that by Death no more was intended than only *living* in some different manner, or a Continuation of their Consciousness and real Existence in some other Place."

"Place. No! That was the Philosophy
 "of After-ages." Now, I think, I can conceive some-
 thing like this, in Part at least. I can
 conceive, that God, who communicated
 to *Adam* (as the learned generally sup-
 pose) such a Knowledge of the *Nature*
 and Properties of the *Brute Animals*, as
 enabled him to give them all Names ex-
 pressive of their respective Natures,*
 would hardly leave our first Parents un-
 acquainted with That *superior* Excellency
 of their own Nature, which was to be
 the Foundation of their *Dominion* over
 the *inferior* Creation.† And thus, by
 Means of Divine Revelation, *Adam*
 might be able to "distinguish upon the
 "different Parts of his Constitution,"
 might have the Knowledge of an *imma-*
terial Principle united with his Body, a
 Principle of Reason, Understanding,
 and Judgment, sufficiently qualifying
 him for the Government of That Part of
 the Creation, which was made subject
 unto him.

H 2 Whether
 * Gen. ii. 19, 20. † Gen. i. 26, 28.

A Whether our first Parents had any Knowledge, either by Communication from God, or the Exercise of their own Reason, of That *natural Immortality* of the Soul, thro' which it is incapable of Dissolution by those Causes, which dissolve and destroy the Animal Frame, may be doubted. Such Knowledge was unnecessary to them before their Fall, and, perhaps, improper for them after it. In their State of Innocence, they were in actual Possession of an Immortality, not liable to be interrupted by any Separation between Soul and Body, and therefore had no need of being acquainted with the Consequences of such a Separation. In their State of Sin, Part of their Punishment might be divinely appointed to consist in their *Ignorance* of any Survivorship of the Immaterial Principle; so that, with an Assurance of a future Restoration to Life, they must go down to the Grave with the disagreeable and melancholy Reflection on the *present* Loss of every Blessing they enjoyed, and a *present* Annihilation

lation or utter Extinction of Being. W A Punishment, * in itself severe enough to satisfy the Divine Justice for their Transgression, exclusive of That Subjection to Sickness and Infirmity, in which the Change of their Bodies from *immortal* to *mortal* must necessarily occasion.

It may be granted, then, that our first Parents had no Apprehension of “*living*” in some different Manner, or a Continuation of their Consciousness and “*real Existence*” in some other Place. “*No*!” (as the learned Writer very justly observes) “That was the Philosophy of “*After-ages*”—when Human Reason, upon a thorough Enquiry into the *Nature of Things*, saw clearly the Necessity of an *immaterial Principle* in Man, and its natural Capacity of *surviving* the Dissolution and Death of the Body.

In
* This very Part of Adam's Punishment, the Writers, I oppose, would continue to *Us*, his Posterity, even under the Christian Covenant of Grace and Mercy, by sending us to our Graves with the same melancholy and disagreeable Prospect of *present Annihilation*.

In short, As the *Terms* of the Sentence, pronounced upon our first Parents, conclude nothing against the Existence and natural Immortality of the Human Soul; so neither does the *Sense*, in which *Adam* and *Eve* must be supposed to have understood That Sentence. Allowing them to be as ignorant as you please of any immaterial Principle united with their Bodies; it will not follow, that therefore there was none, since Ignorance of a Thing, in the wisest and most knowing of Men, was never yet admitted as a Proof of its *Non-Existence*.

SECTION IV.

The THIRD PROPOSITION, by which the *intermediate State* of the Soul, and, consequently, its very *Existence* as an immaterial Principle, are to be set aside, is—The Restoration of Life and Consciousness to the Dead will not take Place till the Resurrection.

In Support of this Proposition, Dr. Lathrop appeals to those Scriptures, which inform

* Appendix, p. 387—401.

form us, (1.) That we shall not awake or be made alive 'till the Resurrection; as, I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy Likeness. Psal. xviii. 15. This is the Father's Will—that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last Day. John vi. 39. (2.) That the Wicked shall not be severed from the Righteous 'till the Resurrection, the End of the World, &c. See our Saviour's Parable of the Tares, Matt. 13. and Description of the Judgment, Matt. 25. (3.) That we are upon Trial, or in a State of Probation, 'till the Resurrection or the Day of Christ; as, that ye may be sincere and without Offence 'till the Day of Christ. Phil. i. 10. (4.) That our Christian Course and Improvements in Piety in this World terminate in the Resurrection, the Coming or Day of our Lord; as, Being confident of this very Thing, that he which hath begun a good Work in you, will perform it until the Day of Jesus Christ. Phil. i. 6. (5.) The Elect shall not be gathered together 'till the Resurrection; We beseech you, Brethren, by the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by

our

our gathering together unto him. 2 Thess. ii. 1. (6.) The World shall not be judged before the Resurrection, &c. See the whole Scripture Doctrine of the Judgment. (7.) Sincere Christians will not have Boldness or Confidence before Christ 'till the Resurrection, &c. as, Herein is our Love made perfect, that we may have Boldness in the Day of Judgment. 1 John iv. 17. (8.) The virtuous shall not be rewarded 'till the Resurrection, &c. as, They cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the Resurrection of the just, Luke xiv. 14. and Scripture Doctrine of the Judgment. (9.) They shall not have eternal Life or Salvation; shall not put on Immortality, &c. 'till the Resurrection, &c. as, When Christ, who is our Life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in Glory. Col. iii. 4. Henceforth there is laid up for me a Crown of Righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me at That Day. 2 Tim. iv. 8. Scripture Doctrine of the Judgment. (10.) They, their Faith, Labours, and Sufferings are lost, perished, unprofitable, if there be no Resurrection;

as, *Then* (i. e. if Christ be not raised) *they which are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished,* 1 Cor. xv. 18. *Therefore—be ye stedfast, unmoveable—forasmuch as ye know that your Labour is not in vain in the Lord.* ver. 58.

(11.) *The Resurrection is the grand Object of our Faith, Hope, and Comfort; as, Of the Hope and Resurrection of the Dead I am called in Question.* Acts xxiii. 6. *Then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up, &c. wherefore comfort one another with these Words.* 1 Thess. iv. 17, 18. (12.) *The Wicked shall not be punished till the Resurrection. Our Saviour's Description of the Judgment.* Matt. 25.

“All this” (says the learned Writer)
 “plainly shews, that the Scripture, in
 “speaking of the Connection between
 “our present and future Being, doth
 “not take into the Account our interme-
 “diate State in Death, no more than we,
 “in describing the Course of a Man's
 “Actions, take in the Time he sleeps.
 “Therefore the Scriptures (to be con-
 “sistent with themselves) must affirm an
 “immediate Connection between Death

"and Judgment. Heb. ix. 27. *It is ap-*
 "pointed unto Men once to die, but after
 "this the Judgment. For" which Reason
 (adds the Doctor) "the Scriptures re-
 "present the Coming of Christ as near at
 "Hand. Rom. xiii. 12. Phil. iv. 5. Isa.
 "v. 8. Rev. xxii. 7. also that He, his
 "Day, will come suddenly, as a Snare,
 "a Thief, upon all the World; and we
 "are cautioned to watch and be sober,
 "that it surprize us not unprepared.
 "Luke xii. 40. xxi. 34, 35, 36. 1 Thess.
 "v. 2, &c.

"Every Thing" (saith Bp. Warburton
 somewhere) "hath two Academical
 "Handles." This is the Case here. For,
 That very Scripture Language, which
 the Master of Peter-House alledges as an
 Argument against the intermediate State,
 the Reader will find, in the first of my
 intended Dissertations, considered as one
 great Proof of such a State—But I shall
 not anticipate That Argument, any far-
 ther than to observe, that, even upon
 the Supposition of an intermediate State
 of

of *real Life*, there is no Impropriety in the Scripture's representing Death as *immediately* followed by Judgment; since the intermediate State not being a State of Trial or Probation, the Case of every Man, at the great Day of Account, will be exactly the same, as if no Time had elapsed between the Separation and Reunion of his Soul and Body.

As to the Texts, which represent the *Coming of Christ as near at Hand*; they may much more properly be understood (as they are by the best Interpreters) of the approaching *Destruction of Jerusalem*, That Coming of Christ, which was literally near at Hand, than of his coming to judge the World, at the Distance of many Centuries from the Deaths of Multitudes of Christians, who have left this World since the Date of those Apostolical Warnings. It may be true, that, supposing no intermediate State of *Consciousness*, Death and Judgment will appear to Men (just restored to Life) as *contiguous Events*, the whole Interval of Time between them being to the *Dead*

as no Duration at all.* But, as the Texts in Question may justly be referred to the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, there can be no Necessity of construing them to any other Meaning.

SECTION V.

The FOURTH PROPOSITION or Objection is: The Texts of Scripture, alledged to prove the *separate* Existence of the Soul, prove no such Thing.

Out of twenty seven, commented on by Dr.

Hence *Luther*, speaking of the Death of *John*, Elector of *Saxony*, who died of an Apoplexy, as he was returning from the Chace, in 1582, has this remarkable Reflection on it: *Cum resurrecturus est, in die novissimo, putabit se ex Saltu Lochavienst, ubi venabatur, venire.* i. e. "When He (the Elector) shall rise, at the last Day, he will think himself just come from the Forest, where he hunted." *Seckendorf, Hist. Luth.* 1. 3. p. 30.

This Truth is usually illustrated by the familiar Case of a Man just awoken out of a sound Sleep without dreaming. The Time passed (several Hours perhaps) between his falling asleep and waking, appear to him as nothing, or a few Minutes at most.

Dr. Law, † I shall single out *three or four* of the more remarkable and striking Passages of the New Testament; and shall begin with

Matt. x. 28. *Fear not them which kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul: but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both Body and Soul in Hell.*

“This” (says the Doctor) “only points out the Distinction between this and the next Life, when Soul and Body shall be re-united, and future Punishments commence.”

It seems, then, there is such a Thing as Soul distinct from Body; they being (by the Doctor's own Confession) to be re-united in the next Life. If, by the Soul, we are to understand Life only, then the Word Life may be substituted in the Place of the Word Soul; and then the Passage will run thus, “Fear not them which kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Life, &c.” Absurd! For whoever kills the Body, effectually destroys the Life of the Body. But let

us

† *Ubi supra.* p. 401—414.

us attend to the plain and obvious
Meaning of our Saviour's Words.

Here is, first, a plain Distinction of
Man into two Parts, a (*σῶμα*) *Body*, and a
(*ψυχή*) *Soul*. The former is declared to be
vulnerable, and capable of being killed
or destroyed by external Violence; the
latter *invulnerable*, and incapable of be-
ing killed or destroyed by any Force of
Man whatever. It is, likewise, plainly
supposed, that the Soul will *survive* the
Body. For, if the Body be killed, and
the Soul be left untouched and unhurt,
the latter must continue to live, for
some Time at least, after its Separation
from the former. And, whence is it,
that *they which kill the Body are not able to*
kill the Soul? Whence, but from hence,
that the Soul is an *immaterial* or *spirit-*
tual Substance, and, consequently, in-
capable of Destruction by That Violence,
which destroys the Animal Frame. As
to That *Destruction of both Body and Soul*
in Hell, which God is able to effect, it is
to be understood of the Punishment or
Misery

Misery of the damned, compounded of Body and Soul, in the Place of Torment.

Another Text, to be considered, shall be

Luke xx. 38. *He is not a God of the Dead, but of the Living.* Which Dr. Law explains thus:

“ He cannot be called the God of such
 “ as be *finally* dead; but being still in
 “ Covenant with these [Heb. xi. 16.—God
 “ is not ashamed to be called their God:
 “ *for he hath prepared for them a City*] they
 “ in Effect live to him [Rom. iv. 17.—who
 “ quickeneth the Dead, and calleth those
 “ *Things which be not, as though they were*]
 “ though not to themselves or one an-
 “ other [if they did, our Saviour’s Proof
 “ of a Resurrection from thence would
 “ be utterly destroyed] being as sure of
 “ a future Life, as if they were already
 “ in Possession of it.”

It will be necessary to produce the whole Passage, as follows. Now, that the Dead are raised, even Moses sheweth at the Bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God

God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the Dead, but of the Living: for All live to him.

The true Interpretation of this Passage I take to be That, which the learned Bp. of Gloucester gives us of the parallel Place of St. Matthew: Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the Power of God— But, as touching the Resurrection of the Dead, Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living.*

This is what the Bishop calls “ the famous Argument of Jesus against the Sadducees;” and his Lordship thus explains it. “ The Case stood thus: He was here arguing against the Sadducees. Now these supported their Opinion, of no Resurrection of the Body, on a Principle that the Soul had no separate Existence, but fell into nothing at the Dissolution of the Union; which Principle once overthrown, they had nothing left to oppose to the Writings of the Prophets, or the Preaching of Jesus.”

* Matt. xxii. 29—32.

" Jesus. Against this Principle there-
 " fore our blessed Lord thus divinely
 " argues:—' But as concerning the Re-
 " surrection of the Dead, You ground
 " your Denial of it on this Supposition,
 " that the Soul dies with the Body: but
 " you err as much in not knowing the
 " Scriptures, as in not rightly conceiv-
 " ing of the Power of God. For the
 " Words of the Law, which you allow
 " to be a good Authority, directly prove,
 " that the Soul doth not die with the
 " Body, but hath a separate Existence.
 " Now Moses tells us, that God, long
 " after the Death of Abraham, Isaac,
 " and Jacob, called himself *their God*:
 " But God is not the God of the Dead, but
 " of the Living: therefore the Souls of
 " those Patriarchs are yet existing in a
 " separate State.' This" (says his Lord-
 " ship) " is the Force of the Argument."*

K And

* *Divine Legation of Moses.* ed. 1758. vol. 4.
 p. 343—346.

The anonymous Author of, the *Short Historical*
View, &c. is pleased to sneer Bp. Warburton's In-
 terpretation of our Saviour's Argument, in the
 following Words. " It is true, the Substantial

And a decisive one it is against All, who hold the same Sadducean Principle.

I shall

Forms of the *Thomists* are no longer in Repute, and the Argument drawn from thence for the Immortality of the Soul, is, in these more enlightened Days, exploded. But That is only to make Way for another *scholastic* Argument, equally obscure and precarious, devised by *Descartes*, and adopted by many good Christians and true Protestants to this Hour; who are just as positive as *Leo* and his Doctors" (*Pope Leo X. and the Lateran Council in 1513*) "that the Philosophical and Evangelical Arguments for Immortality, stand upon the same Foundation. In Support of which Notion, a Doctor of our own, of no inconsiderable Figure, hath introduced our blessed Saviour deducing his Argument for a Resurrection of the Dead, against the Sadducees, *Matt. xxii. 29.* through the Medium of the *Separate Existence* of the Soul. What a Million of Pities that such a Discovery should escape the Sagacity of *Leo*, and his *Lateran Counsellors!*" p. 7.

From hence one would judge, that the Bishop represents our Saviour as employing the Doctrine of the *separate Existence* of the Human Soul, as a direct and formal Proof of a *Bodily Resurrection*. Which would, indeed, be a very extraordinary Discovery. But, no such Thing. His Lordship considers (and very justly) "the Introduction to our Saviour's Argument" (*But as touching the Resurrection from the Dead*) not as "an Exordium to a direct Proof," but as "an Intimation only,

I shall only add, that to be *really dead*,
(as the Patriarchs certainly were) and

K 2

yet

“ to what an *indirect* one tended; namely, that
“ the *Resurrection of the Body* may be *inferred thro’*
“ the Medium of the separate Existence of the
“ Soul; which” (says his Lordship) “ was the
“ only Point” our Saviour “ proposed to prove
“ *directly* to” the Sadducees. And in this very
Light *Hugo Grotius* considers our Saviour’s Argu-
ment; observing, that Christ (*Sadduceas non ver-
bis directis, sed ratiocinando refellit*) “ confutes the
“ Sadducees, not by direct Proof, but by Rati-
“ onal Inference.” *Ep. 130.*

To explain this Matter a little farther, It is
evident from the sacred History, that the Sad-
ducees held *there was no Resurrection, neither Angel,
nor Spirit*, Acts xxiii. 8. connecting together the
Resurrection of the Body and the Existence of
Spiritual Beings; insomuch that, if there be no
such Thing as *Spirit*, and, consequently, no im-
material Principle or Soul in Man, there can be
no Bodily Resurrection. In Order, therefore,
to establish the Belief of the Resurrection (pro-
fessed by the Pharisees, tho’ denied by the Sad-
ducees) our Saviour takes upon him to prove,
out of the Jewish Scriptures (not the *Resurrection*,
but) the *separate Existence* of the Souls of *Abraham*,
Isaac, and *Jacob*; and thereby effectually re-
moves the Prejudice, upon which the Denial of
the Resurrection was built. So truly has the
Author of the *Divine Legation* expressed the Force
of our Saviour’s Argument against the Sadducees;

yet (as Dr. Law and some other Interpreters express it) to *live in Effect*, and to *live to God*, though not to themselves, or one another, is a Kind of Life not extremely intelligible, nor explained to Satisfaction by their "being as sure of a future Life, as if they were already in Possession of it."

The third Text shall be Acts vii. 59. *They stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit.*

"That is" (says Dr. Law) "*my Life.*"

But is not This to make the holy Martyr's Prayer Nonsense? Is it not to make him say, *Lord Jesus, receive my—NOTHING?* For, what is the Life of a dead Man, or Life extinguished? Nothing.

Lastly, let us consider

2 Cor. vi. 8. *Knowing that whilst we are at home in the Body, we are absent from the Lord—willing rather to be absent from the Body, and present with the Lord.*

"This and so little does he deserve the *sarcastical Fling* of our candid Historian.

"This" (says Dr. Law) "is strictly
 "true, since Time unperceived making
 "no Distance or Difference, the Season
 "of each Person's Recompense really
 "coincides with That of his Death; and,
 "therefore, to be absent from our natu-
 "ral Body, is to be cloathed with a
 "spiritual one—That St. Paul had no
 "Thought of an intermediate State, is
 "plain from the first four Verses: We
 "know, that if our earthly House of this
 "Tabernacle were dissolved, &c. as also
 "from ver. 10. plainly referring all to
 "the general Judgment."

The learned Writer's Observation
 concerning Time unperceived may be very
 just, but is nothing to the Purpose. For,
 that St. Paul's Words refer to the Interval
 of Time between Death and the Resur-
 rection, and not to the Season of Recom-
 pense after the Resurrection, may be
 evinced from a similar Passage: *I am in
 a strait betwixt two, having a Desire to de-
 part, and be with Christ, which is far bet-
 ter: nevertheless, to abide in the Flesh, is*
more

*more needful for you.** That is, "My
 " Desires are divided between the two
 " Conditions of longer *Life* or present
 " *Death*: To die and be with Christ
 " would be more immediately benefi-
 " cial to *me*, but to live longer is better
 " for *you* and the Christian Church; and
 " therefore I am very free to do it. †
 Where the Apostle plainly supposes, that
 He himself might go to Christ in another
 World, and leave his Disciples behind
 him in This. Which could not be, but
 during the Time preceeding the gene-
 ral Resurrection.

But, how was it possible, *Paul* should
 be *absent from the Body* and *present with*
the Lord, if he had no immaterial Prin-
 ciple or Soul, to survive his Body?
 The Body cannot be *absent* from itself;
 and, Whatever is absent from the Body,
 must be *distinct* from the Body. But the
 Apostle supposes, he himself might be
absent from his own Body. Therefore he
 had *Something* belonging to his Nature,
distinct from his Body, and capable of
 a *sepa-*

* *Phil. i. 23, 24.*

† *Pyle's Paraphrase.*

a separate Existence. In short, upon the Hypothesis of *No Soul*, or *Soul and Life* being the same Thing, the Words *absent from the Body and present with the Lord*, are as complete Nonsense, as ever proceeded from Ignorance and Want of Judgment. Which, surely, cannot be imputed to a learned *Pharisee*, * *brought up at the Feet of the great Gamaliel*, † and appointed by Christ himself to be the *Apostle of the Gentiles*. ‡

The Vindication of these four Texts, from the Misinterpretation of the *Master of Peter-House*, determines the Fate of the rest, by sufficiently proving, that the *Existence and Separate Existence of the Human Soul*, is, really, a *Scripture-Doctrine*.

SECTION VI.

THE FIFTH OBJECTION to which Doctrine is contained in the following PROPOSITION: That *Immortality of Man*, of which the Scriptures speak, is not a *Natural Immortality*, but the *Gift of God thro' Christ Jesus*.

Our

* *Acts* xxiii. 6. † *Acts* xxii. 3.

‡ *Acts* ix. 15. *Rom.* xi. 13.

Our "Deliverance" (from the *Reign of Death*) "is every where" (says Dr. Law) "represented in Scripture as commencing at the *Resurrection*; nor can any Thing else constitute the Opposition" (between the Forfeiture and Restoration of *Life*:) "for if Death be a Return to *Dust*, then nothing but a *reviving*, or a Resuscitation from That *Dust*, can be the reversing of it, or a proper Recovery from it: and accordingly to this, and this alone, St. Paul confines the Contrast he has drawn at large between the first and second Adam: *Since by Man came Death, by Man came also the Resurrection of the Dead*; and, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive: * Which Life

* Here Dr. Law cites the learned Dr. Taylor of Norwich, who explains these Words of St. Paul as directly affirming, "that a Resurrection or being made alive again is granted, assured, and executed by and in Christ alone;" and as evidently presupposing, "1. That the Dead are not made alive till the Resurrection; for the Resurrection of the Dead, and being made alive, are here Expressions of the same Signification. 2. That, had not a Resurrection been provided, we should

" Life is, not an inherent Property of
 " our original Nature, but a free Gift to
 " us, * procured by Christ; and accord-
 " ingly termed *the Grace or Gift of God,*
 " and *the Gift by Grace thro' Jesus Christ,*
 " our Lord; † who on that Account is
 " pleased to style himself *the Resurrection,*
 " and *the Life,* ‡ who is called *our Life,* §
 " and is said to have *the Keys of Hades*
 " and of *Death:* who opens for us the
 " true and only Way to Immortality
 " thro' the Gate of the *Resurrection,* and
 " without whom there is no Admission
 " to it, but *the Wrath of God abideth on*
 " us. || So far is it from Truth, that
 " Immortal Life may be discovered by
 " the Light of Nature; that, on the con-
 " trary, we are taught to believe, it
 " was Christ only, who by his Death

L. *abolished*

" never after Death have been made alive." Script.
 Doctr. of Orig. Sin. p. 24.

* John v. 40. vi. 33. 51. 57. x. 28. xiv.
 6. 19. xvii. 2. 22. 1 John ii. 25. v. 11. 12.

† Rom. v. 14—17. vi. 23. viii. 2. 1 Cor. xv. 22. 57. 1 Pet. iii. 7.

‡ John xi. 25.

§ Col. iii. 4.

|| John iii. 26.

"abolished Death, and brought Life and
 "Immortality to Light by his Gospel." &c.†

Hence the learned Writer represents
 the commonly-received Doctrine of the
Soul's Natural Immortality as "a manifest
 "Derogation from, if not a total Sub-
 "version of, That positive Covenant,
 "which professes to intitle us to ever-
 "lasting Life;" and the Maintainers of
 That Doctrine as "giving up the pe-
 "culiar Benefits and some of the prin-
 "cipal Parts of Christianity," and "com-
 "plimenting Natural Religion with all
 "the Discoveries and all the Privileges
 "that belong to Revelation."†

The anonymous Author of the *Short
 Historical View, &c.* (already cited) states
 the Question (accurately enough) be-
 tween the Maintainers of the common
 Doctrine and their Opposers; and gives
 us a short and clear Representation of
 the Doctrine maintained by the latter.
 "The Question" (says he) "is, whether
 "the

* 2 Tim. i. 10.

† *Nature and End of Death, &c.* ubi supra.
 p. 340—342.

‡ *Postscript to Appendix, ubi supra.*

“ the Scriptures afford any just and solid
 “ Grounds for the Doctrine of the Im-
 “ mortality of the Soul of Man, and
 “ particularly any Evidence of its Exis-
 “ tence, when disunited from the Body,
 “ in a State of conscious Perception;
 “ and whether, in Consequence of this
 “ Notion, there is not a certain inter-
 “ mediate State of Happiness and Misery
 “ for good and wicked Men respectively,
 “ between Death and the general Refur-
 “ rection. They, who hold the Nega-
 “ tive in these Points, alledge, that, ac-
 “ cording to the Scriptures, Life and
 “ Immortality were brought to Light by
 “ the Gospel of Christ, in a Sense ex-
 “ clusive of all other Teachers, and all
 “ other Revelation, at least from the
 “ Birth of *Moses* downwards; exclusive
 “ likewise of all Information from the
 “ Light of Nature, or the Result of Phi-
 “ losophical Disquisitions on the Sub-
 “ stance or Qualities of the Human
 “ Soul. They insist, that Christ is *the*
 “ *Way, the Truth, and the Life*, so that no
 “ Man cometh to the Father (so as to be
 “ like

like him, and see him as he is, in a future State) but by the Mediatorial Power of Christ. That the Way of coming to God, in the Sense, and by the Means above-mentioned, is the Resurrection of the Dead, of which Assurance is given unto all Men by the Resurrection of JESUS. *

Another late anonymous Writer affirms "the Soul of Man" to be "a mere mortal in herself, 'till she derives her Spirit or quickening Principle by Regeneration from Christ the Second Adam." For this he refers to 1 Cor. xv. 47. John i. 13. Eph. ii. 1. and goes on: "By this Derivation (which St. Peter calls, 2 Pet. i. 4. a being made a Partaker of the Divine Nature) she becomes, what her second Father is, a living Spirit, as says our Lord, John iii. 6. That which is born of the Flesh is Flesh, and That which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. John vi. 63. It is the Spirit that quickeneth. So says St. Peter, (1 Pet. i. 3, 4.) He (Christ) hath begotten us

* Prefatory Discourse, p. 26, 27.

" us again (Rom. ix. 26. *the Children of*
 " *the living God*, and by so being) to an
 " *Inheritance incorruptible*—St. Paul tells
 " us (1 Tim. vi. 16.) that *God only hath*
 " *Immortality*; and does not this suffici-
 " ently prove, that his Creatures have
 " it not? and that Immortality can no
 " otherwise be had by them than from
 " him? and it is produced in us (1 Pet.
 " i. 23.) *out of an incorruptible Seed by the*
 " *Logos of the living God*—The Mortality
 " of the Soul was therefore a Doctrine
 " universally received by the primitive
 " Christian Writers, namely *Justin Mar-*
 " *tyr, Tatian, Irenæus, Athenagoras, The-*
 " *ophilus Antiochenus, Tertullian, Cyprian,*
 " *Arnobius, Lactantius*, as well as by the
 " Jews of the Apostolic Age; till about
 " the End of the fourth Century, when
 " the Opinion of a natural Immortality
 " in the Soul first began to spread itself,
 " with the notorious Decay of Christian
 " Faith and Light. Indeed common
 " Sense may teach us, that whatsoever
 " is passible (as the Soul is) must also be
 " mortal in its own Nature, since Pas-
 " sion

"*tion or Suffering tends to Dissolution, and so to Death.*" *

These Extracts from the three latest Writers against the Doctrine of an *immortal Soul* contain the full Force of the Objection to That Doctrine, taken from the *positive* Declarations of the New Testament concerning the *proper Immortality of Man*.

But, before we take it into Consideration, it will be proper to obviate an incidental Objection to the common Doctrine, from the *Silence* of the Scriptures as to any *natural Immortality* of the Soul. Dr. Law assures us,† that "some of the most eminent Patrons" of That Doctrine "cannot help observing, that they don't find it in the Scriptures," and refers us to Tillotson—Let us produce the Archbishop's Words. In a Discourse on John iv. 24. *God is a Spirit, &c.* having observed, that "we no where meet with this Expression, or any other equivalent

* *Universal Restitution, a Scripture Doctrine.* 1761. p. 384—386.

† *Nature and End of Death, &c.* ubi supra. p. 338, 339.

"quivalent to it, that *God is a Spirit,*
 "but only in this Place;" he has this
 Remark: "For we are to know, that
 "the Scripture supposeth us to be Men,
 "and to partake of the common Noti-
 "ons of Human Nature, and therefore
 "doth not teach us Philosophy, nor so-
 "licitously instruct us in those Things
 "which are born with us; but supposeth
 "the Knowledge of these, and makes
 "Use of these common Principles and
 "Notions which are in us, concerning
 "God, and the Immortality of our
 "Souls, and the Life to come, to excite
 "us to our Duty, and quicken our En-
 "deavours after Happiness. For I do
 "not find, that the Doctrine of the Im-
 "mortality of the Soul is any where ex-
 "pressly delivered in Scripture, but
 "taken for granted; in like Manner, that
 "the Scripture doth not solicitously in-
 "struct us in the natural Notions which
 "we have of God, but supposeth them
 "known to us." *

This

* Archbishop Tillotson's Works. fol. vol. 2. p.
 670.

This Reason, assigned by the Archbishop, Dr. Law tells us,* is "not unsuitable to the Prejudices of his Time: whereas, if he had considered the Point more fully, I presume," (says the Doctor) "he would have found the Scripture, not taking this for granted, but rather laying down the contrary." But, was the Time, when the great Prelate lived, more over-run with Prejudices, than the present? I presume, not. His Grace's Observation, that the Scripture "doth not" (was not intended to) "teach us Philosophy," is so manifestly true, that Dr. Law, I presume, will not deny it. For, to instance only in the Philosophy of the *Mundane System*. The Scriptures are so far from teaching us, that the Sun is fixed in the Centre of the World, and that the Earth, with the rest of the Planets, revolve about That Luminary, that the Language of the inspired Writers seems to establish the direct contrary Doctrine.† And yet, I presume, the

Coper-

* *Ubi supra.*

† Thus Joshua x. 12, 13. Then spake Joshua—and said in the Sight of all Israel, Sun, stand thou still

Copernican or Newtonian Philosophy of the Heavens, and not the *Tychonic* and *Ptolemaic*, is taught in *St. Peter's College* in *Cambridge*, as well as generally embraced by the *Mathematicians* and *Astronomers* of the present Age.

So that, were there, really, no *Affertions* or *Intimations* of the *Soul's* natural *Immortality* to be found in *Scripture*, but, on the contrary, the plainest *Affertions*, that *Death* destroys the whole *Man* (the very *Creed* of *Dr. Lazo* and others)

M

upon *Gibeon*, and, thou *Moon*, in the *Valley of Ajalon*. And the *Sun* stood still, and the *Moon* stayed—so the *Sun* stood still in the *Midst of Heaven*, and hastened not to go down about a whole *Day*. This *Arrest* of the *Sun* and *Moon*, at the *Command* of *Joshua*, being represented as a *Thing* contrary to the *Course* of *Nature*, it is plain, the *Historian* speaks agreeably to *Vulgar Prejudice*, and supposes, contrary to the *Truth* of *Astronomy*, that the *Sun* moves round the *Earth*. And the same *vulgar Error* is countenanced by the *Royal Psalmist*, *Psal. xix. 4—6*. In them (*viz. in the Heavens*) hath he set a *Tabernacle* for the *Sun*; which is, as a *Bridegroom* coming out of his *Chamber*, and rejoiceth as a *strong Man* to run a *Race*. His going forth is from the *End* of *Heaven*, and his *Circuit* unto the *Ends* of it: and there is nothing hid from the *Heat* thereof.

it would not necessarily follow, that there is, really, no such Thing, in Man, as an immaterial and immortal Principle; since it might very justly be supposed, that, in such Assertions, the Scripture Language is accommodated to vulgar Apprehension; according to which, Man *appears* to be formed of mere Matter, and his Death to be a total Extinction of all Life and Sense; while, at the same Time, true Philosophy evinces, that there must be an *immaterial Principle* in Man, and that this Principle will naturally *survive* the Death of his Body. But, whoever recollects the Explications of Scripture in the foregoing Section, will see Reason to think, that Archbp. Tillotson conceded a great deal too much, when he allowed, that “the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul is no where expressly delivered in Scripture, but taken for granted;” since the Texts above-explained, and particularly That containing our Saviour’s great Argument against the Sadducees, amount to more than Intimations,

tions, to direct Assertions or Proofs of That Immortality.

But, to proceed:

SECTION VII.

In Order to a full Confutation of the Objections against the natural Immortality of the Soul, founded in the positive Declarations of Scripture, I shall now lay before the Reader what appears to me to be the true *Scripture Doctrine* of *Man's Immortality*, and to shew, that it is perfectly consistent with the Doctrine of an *immaterial* and *naturally-immortal Principle* in Man. This is the grand Hinge, upon which the whole Controversy must turn. For, if the natural Immortality of the Soul cannot be reconciled with the plain Scripture Doctrine of *Everlasting Life*, it must give Way; nor can any Arguments, from Reason and Nature, be strong enough for its Support.

The capital Text of the New Testament, in which the Doctrine of Immortality is contained, and on which (the

Reader must have observed) the great Stress of the Question is laid, is, That of St. Paul; where, speaking of the *Appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ*, he adds, *Who hath abolished Death, and hath brought Life and Immortality to Light, thro' the Gospel.** We will consider the full Meaning and Import of this great and comprehensive Christian Doctrine.

I pass over That *Interpretation* of the Apostle's Words, which makes nothing more of them than a mere *Illustration* or *clearing up* of the Doctrine of Immortality, made known to us, tho' not so clearly, by the Light of Reason and Nature alone; † because, tho' the Words will

* 2 Tim. i. 10.

† The Reader shall have That Interpretation in the Words of a very eminent Writer. "To *bring any Thing to Light* may signify, according to the Idiom of the English Tongue, to discover or reveal a Thing which was perfectly unknown before: But the Word in the Original is so far from countenancing, that it will hardly admit of this Sense. The Greek runs thus; *paristatōs de Lūm ē adlagōiay*. Now *paristatōs* signifies (not to bring to Light, but) to enlighten, illustrate, or clear up any Thing. You may judge by the Use of the Word in

will bear That Sense, I verily think, St. Paul, by the Use of them, meant to express, not any *Privilege* of Nature, but the *peculiar Benefits and Advantages* of the *Christian Covenant*.

I entirely agree with Dr. Law and the Author of the *Short Historical View*, in understanding St. Paul's Words of the *Resurrection* of the Dead. But I am much deceived, and but little acquainted with the Covenant of Grace in Christ

Jesus,

“ other Places: 'Tis used in *John i. 9.* That was
 “ the true Light, which lighteth (or enlighteneth) every
 “ Man that cometh into the World; ὁ φωτίζων πάντα
 “ ἀνθρώπων. Jesus Christ did not by coming into
 “ the World bring Men to Light; but he did by
 “ the Gospel enlighten Men, and make those,
 “ who were dark and ignorant before, wise unto
 “ Salvation. In like Manner, our Lord did
 “ enlighten the Doctrine of Life and Immorta-
 “ lity, not by giving the first and only Notice
 “ of it, but by clearing up the Doubts and Dif-
 “ ficulties under which it laboured, and giving
 “ a better Evidence for the Truth and Certainty
 “ of it, than Nature or any Revelation before
 “ had done.” *Bp. Sherlock's Discourses*, v. 1. p. 189.
 But, by the good Prelate's Leave, the Word
 φωτίζειν signifies to instruct or teach, as well as to
 illustrate. So *Gl. V. metaph. mentis oculos illumino,*
doceo. Vid. *Hederici Lexicon.*

Jesus, if the Words *Life and Immortality* are to be understood of the *Resurrection* ONLY. They are Words of much greater Latitude, and comprehend the whole *Oeconomy of Grace*, the *Gifts of Righteousness or Holiness* in this Life, and of *everlasting Happiness* in the next. This I shall endeavour to evince, and then shew, how consistent the *full* Meaning of the Apostle's Words is with the Doctrine of an immaterial and naturally-immortal Principle in Man.

The Words *Death* (*θάνατος*) and *Life* (*ζῆν*) are metaphorically used to denote the *natural* and *regenerate* State of Man, his State of Sin by Nature, and his State of Righteousness and Holiness thro' Grace. Thus St. Paul tells us, that *to be carnally-minded is Death, but to be spiritually-minded is Life and Peace*; * and good Christians are said to be *alive from the Dead*, or *alive unto God thro' Jesus Christ our Lord*. † Again: *You hath he quickened, who were dead in Trespasses and Sins*. ‡ And again:

We

* Rom. viii. 6.

† Rom. vi. 11, 13.

‡ Eph. ii. 1.

We know, that we have passed from Death unto Life, because we love the Brethren: he that loveth not his Brother, abideth in Death. § Where Benevolence or the Love of our Fellow-Creatures is considered as a sure Mark or Character of our Christian *Regeneration*.

I am aware, that the *Life*, spoken of in these Passages, is, by many, understood to mean, not any Kind of Life *at present* inherent in us, but only that Title to *everlasting Life*, which our Christian Discipleship confers upon us. And I will not deny that the Passages will bear this Sense. But they admit likewise of the other. And surely, no Figures can more strongly and beautifully express the Difference between a State of *Sin* and a State of *Holiness*, than those of *Death* and *Life*. The Wicked are *dead* to Virtue and Goodness; all the Faculties of their Minds and Bodies, with Respect to those Objects, being entirely locked up or suspended; The Righteous are *alive* to the Practice of every Thing that is good, exerting the full

full Vigour both of Mind and Body in the Discharge of their Christian Duty. *St. Paul*, therefore, besides the Doctrine of the Resurrection, teaches us, that *Christ*, by his appearing, hath abolished, or enabled us to rise from, the *Spiritual Death* of Sin; and hath brought to Light, or revealed the Means of attaining to, the *Spiritual Life* of Righteousness.

How weakly, then, does the Author of *Universal Restitution*, above quoted, alledge such Texts as these, as a Proof, that "the Human Soul is, in its own Nature, mortal or corruptible!" A Change of the *Man*, from a State of Sin to a State of Righteousness, does not, surely, imply any Change in the *Nature* and essential *Properties* of his *Soul*; but only a Change in its acquired *Dispositions* and *Inclinations*. It is as much a *Spirit* in a State of Sin, as in a State of Holiness; and it is its *Spirituality* that is the proper Ground of its *Incorruptibility*. In short, there is no Connection between the *Natural* and *Moral* State of the *Soul*;

(and

and a sinful Soul is, in its own Nature, as immortal as a righteous Soul.

As I shall have no farther Occasion to animadvert on this extraordinary Writer, I shall here dispatch the Remainder of his Argument against the Natural Immortality of the Human Soul. He quotes St. Paul, telling us, that *God only hath Immortality*, and from thence concludes, that "his Creatures have it not." But there are two Senses, in which God alone is immortal, and neither of them excludes all Immortality from belonging to his Creatures. God is *necessarily* immortal, deriving his Immortality from no other Being than Himself: Those of his Creatures, who *have* Immortality, derive it from their Creation by Him. The Immortality of God is his proper *Eternity*; a Duration of Existence, which, as it never can have an End, so neither had it a Beginning; an Eternity (as the Schoolmen express it) both *a Parte ante* and *a Parte post*: The Immortality of God's Creatures (Angels and Human Souls) respects only That Part or Por-

N
tion

tion of Eternity (if I may so speak) which lies before them: in which Sense, tho' they had a Beginning, they will never have an End. This immense Difference between the Immortality of God and the Immortality of Angels and Men sufficiently justifies the Apostle's Assertion, that *God only hath Immortality*, that is, *hath it so* as no Creature can possibly *have it*.

This Writer appeals to the primitive Christian *Fathers*, *Justin Martyr*, &c. as “universally receiving the Doctrine of “the Soul's Mortality.” But it is easy to convict him of misunderstanding and misrepresenting those antient Christian Writers.

Justin Martyr, indeed, says, the Soul is not, *properly*, immortal, for this Reason, “Because it had a Beginning, and “depends continually upon God for “the Preservation of its being.”* But This he says, in Opposition to the extravagant Notions of some pretended *Platonists*, who taught such an Immortality

* *Dialog. cum Tryph.*

lity as implied *Necessity of Existence*. In which Sense, neither the Human Soul, nor Angels themselves (as has been already observed) are immortal, but God only. And in this Opinion, *Irenæus*, and others of the Fathers, who contend for the natural Immortality of the Soul, agree with *Justin Martyr*.

The last-mentioned Father says expressly; “ It is the Body only that dies, “ not the Soul: For, to die, is to lose “ the Powers of Life, Breath, Sense, “ and Motion, and to be separated into “ its first Principles of Composition; “ which the Soul, an uncompounded “ and indissoluble Substance, cannot “ be.”*

Tertullian, it is true, supposed the Soul to be *Material*; the Consequence of which undoubtedly is, that it is *naturally mortal*. But it is certain, *Tertullian* did not see this Consequence (if he had, he would have disowned the Doctrine) because, in many Places, he acknowledges the Immortality of the Soul; de-

N 2

nying,

* *Iren. l. 5. § 7.*

nying; that it "grows on increases, or
"receives Nourishment, lest it should
"follow from thence, that it is liable to
"perish." †

But, of all the primitive *Fathers*, none
have more repeatedly and strongly as-
serted the *natural Immortality* of the Soul,
than *Lactantius*. "It is plain" (says he)
"that the Soul does not perish, nor is
"dissolved, but endures for ever." ‡
He is very large and particular, in con-
futing *Lucretius's* Arguments against the
Immortality of the Soul; affirming, that
"the earthly Part of Man returns to the
"Earth; but that Part, which God
"breathed into him, being of Divine
"Original, lives for ever." ||

These are four of the primitive Chris-
tian Writers, appealed to by our Au-
thor, as holding the *Mortality* of the
Soul. He did well to make no Citations
from

† *Tertul.* De Anima c. 37, 38.

‡ *Apparet Animam non inferire, neque dissolvi, sed
manere in sempiternum.* Inst. Div. Lib. 7. § 9.

|| *Quod ex Terra fuit, in Terram resolvitur; quod
ex caelesti Spiritu, id constat ac viget semper, quoniam
Divinus Spiritus sempiternus est.* Ibid. Lib. 7. § 12.

from them. For, from thence it would have appeared, that the Sense, in which they affirmed the Soul to be *mortal*, was, That of its "Dependence on God for the Preservation of its Being." And what *sober* Christian ever denied the Power of God to destroy or annihilate the Human Soul? * But, at the same Time

* Among the *sober* Maintainers of the Soul's Immortality, we cannot place the late Mr. *William Law*, tho' That Gentleman affirms, that "the Soul is a Partaker of the Eternity of God, and can never cease to be;" because he affirms, at the same Time, that "it is no more a Property of the Divine Omnipotence to be able to annihilate a Soul, than to be able to make an eternal Truth become a Fiction of Yesterday." This strange Position is founded in as strange an Hypothesis, viz. That "Every Creature is nothing else than *Nature* put into a certain Form of Existence;" that "That which thinks and wills in the Soul, is that very same unbeginning Breath, which thought and willed in God, before it was breathed into the Form of a Human Soul;" and that, "The Creation of a Soul is the bringing the Powers of thinking and willing out of their eternal State in the one God, into a beginning State of self-conscious Life distinct from God." Upon the Foot of this Philosophy, it is no Won-

Time that they asserted the Mortality of the Soul, in this Sense, those primitive Writers affirmed it to be naturally *immortal*, in the Sense of its being incapable of Dissolution by those natural Causes, which dissolve and destroy the Bodily Frame. And This (and no other) is That *Immortality* of the Soul, which has been constantly maintained by the most rational Philosophers and Christians of all Ages. Nor do these Fathers agree with our Author, in deriving the Immortality of the Soul from its *Christian Regeneration*; but evidently suppose it to have been created of God in a State of *Natural Immortality*.

But, der he says, "To think it a lessening of the Power of God to say, that he cannot annihilate the Soul, is as absurd as to say, that it is a lessening of the Light of the Sun, if it cannot destroy or darken its own Rays of Light." *An Appeal to all that doubt or disbelieve the Truths of the Gospel*, by W. Law, M. A. 1742. p. 8, 10, 12, 17. I need not observe, that Mr. Law fell into this and many other Absurdities in *Theology*, thro' a religious Veneration for That dark, unintelligible, high-flying, German Enthusiast, Jacob Behmen.

But, to return to *St. Paul's Doctrine of Life and Immortality*:

Now, besides the *animal Death* and *Life* of the Body, and the *spiritual Death* and *Life* of the Soul, the Words *Death* and *Life* are used, in the New Testament, to denote the *Punishment* or *Misery* of the Wicked, and the *Reward* or *Happiness* of the Righteous, in the World to come.

Thus, with Respect to the Punishment of the Wicked, our Saviour says, *If a Man keep my Saying, he shall never see Death.** And his Apostle James, *He which converteth the Sinner from the Error of his Way, shall save a Soul from Death.†* *Death*, in these Passages, cannot denote the Death of the Body (for, with Respect to That, all Men see, and none are saved from Death) but must be understood of That future Death, which will consist in the being lost or dead to all the Joys of a blessed Immortality. St. John speaks of a Second Death. *He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second Death.‡* And Blessed

* John viii. 15. † James v. 20.

‡ Rev. ii. 11.

Blessed and holy is he that hath Part in the first Resurrection: on such the second Death hath no Power. The second Death must succeed, and be different from, the first, or That of the Body; and therefore can be understood of nothing but the Punishment of the Wicked after Death. With Respect to the Reward of the Righteous; St. James says, Blessed is the Man that endureth Temptation; for when he is tried, he shall receive the Crown of Life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him.† And St. John, Be thou faithful unto Death, and I will give thee a Crown of Life.‡ The Crown of Life is represented as the Reward of Virtue, consequent upon Death; and therefore most certainly means the everlasting Happiness of the World to come.*

But the principal Text, from which this Signification of the Word Life may be deduced, is That, in which our Saviour declares the Resurrection, both of the Righteous and the Wicked: All that are in the Graves shall hear his Voice, and shall

* Rev. xx. 6.

† James i. 12.

‡ Rev. ii. 10.

shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of Life; and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation.* The Resurrection of Life, here opposed to the Resurrection of Damnation; cannot mean the Restoration of Life to the Dead, because, in That Sense, both the Righteous and the Wicked come forth to the Resurrection of Life. It must, therefore, be understood of that State of Felicity, which is the Reverse of Damnation or the Punishment of the Wicked. †

Now, according to this Scriptural Sense of the Words *Life* and *Death*, St. Paul's Assertion, that Christ hath abolished Death, and hath brought Life and Immortality to Light through the Gospel, is as if he had told us, that our Saviour hath rescued us from the Punishment due to Sin, and intitled us to everlasting Happiness in a Future State. Nor will it avail against this Interpretation of the Apostle's Words, to alledge, that *Life* and *Immortality* are different Things, and

O

carry

* John v. 28, 29. †

* Rom. xx. 6.
† Rom. ii. 10.

carry distinct Ideas. For it is a well-known Idiom of Scripture-Language, to express a single Thing by two Substantives, one of which carries the Force of an Adjective. And therefore *Life and Immortality* may be considered as tantamount to *immortal, eternal, or everlasting Life*.

I acknowledge, with all Thankfulness to the infinite Author of every good and every perfect Gift,* that the Abolition of Death and Revelation of Life and Immortality, spoken of by St. Paul, are "the Gift of God through Christ Jesus;" and That (as the Author of the *Historical View* expresses it) "exclusive of all other Teachers, and all other Revelation—exclusive likewise of all Information from the Light of Nature, or the Result of Philosophical Disquisitions on the Substance or Qualities of the Human Soul." For, it must be confessed, that it is to the Christian Revelation alone, that we owe the Knowledge of the Resurrection. Nature is so far from teach-

* James i. 17.

teaching us any such Thing, that from thence it appears altogether an *incredible Thing that God should raise the Dead*. * The *Spiritual Life* of the Soul, or such a State of Righteousness and Holiness as *justifies* us in the Sight of God, is unattainable by sinful Man under any *Dispensation* but That of *Grace*; and, consequently, no other *Teacher* but One *come from God*, † no other *Revelation* but the *Christian*, can shew us the Way to everlasting Life and Happiness. So far, I presume, *my Creed* and Dr. *Law's*, &c. agree.

But, where, I ask, is the Inconsistency of this Doctrine, or any Part of it, with That of an immaterial and naturally-immortal Principle in Man? The Restoration of Life to the *Dead*, is, surely, no Argument against the Union of an immaterial Principle with the *living Bodies* of Men; nor is there any Contradiction in the Supposition of a *Spiritual Part* of the Human Composition, and the Survivorship of That Part, even though the dead Body were never to

O 2

rise

* *Acts* xxvi. 8.† *John* iii. 2.

rise again. It is granted, that "if
 " Death" (as Dr. Law says) " be a Re-
 " turn to Dust, then nothing but a *reviv-*
 " *ing* or Resuscitation from That Dust
 " can be the reversing of it, or a proper
 " Recovering from it." This, I say, is
 very true, as far as the Sentence pro-
 nounced on *Adam* is concerned in the
 Argument. But *Death*, we have seen,
 is more than a *Return to Dust*. It is,
 likewise, *dying* to Virtue and Holiness
 in this Life, and to everlasting Happi-
 ness in the next. According to which,
 the Gospel Privilege of *Life* is so far
 from excluding the Notion of an *immor-*
tal Soul, that it rather supposes such a
 Part of the Human Composition, as the
 proper Subject of Holiness and Happi-
 ness.

Thus I have endeavoured to ascertain
 the true Meaning of That *Life* and *Im-*
mortality of Man, of which the Scriptures
 speak; and have shewn (I hope, to the
 Reader's Satisfaction) that no Argument
 can be drawn from it against the *natural*
Immortality of the Soul.

SECTION

SECTION VIII.

The SIXTH and last PROPOSITION or OBJECTION is, That the Doctrine of *Natural Immortality* vacates all Use and Necessity of the *Christian Redemption*.

This Objection is strongly urged by the Author of the *Short Historical View*,* in the following Words: "The Consequence of all which" (viz. of the Human Soul's being immortal in its own Nature, &c.) "is, that there is, and " would have been, a future immortal " State of Being beyond the present " Life, and (the moral Attributes of " God pre-supposed) a just Retribution " therein, independent of the Doctrine " of a Resurrection of the Dead." An Objection of great Weight indeed! For, if the two Doctrines of *Natural Immortality* and *Christian Redemption* cannot stand together, the former must fall, as inconsistent with the Truth of the Christian Religion.

The Author, indeed, takes some Pity on us, and kindly points out " divers " Methods

* *Prefatory Disc.* p. 28.

"Methods of accommodating this Phi-
 "losophical Theory" (of the *Soul's Im-*
mortality), "to the Doctrines of the
 "Scripture," which (he tells us) "have
 "been invented, lest this Creed of Be-
 "lievers in Christ should seem to make
 "void, or at least render insignificant
 "or unnecessary, some of the capital
 "Truths of the Gospel," and "that these
 "Privileges of *Nature*" (That of an im-
 mortal Soul, and a future State of just
 Retribution) "may not appear to tran-
 "scend the Riches of *Gospel-Grace*. The
 "Principal of which" (he tells us) "is,
 "placing *Redemption, Salvation, &c.* in
 "and through Jesus Christ, in Circum-
 "stances, which either keep the Ideas
 "of Life and Death out of Sight, or re-
 "duce them to meer figurative Terms;
 "either, for Example, in Modes of Pu-
 "rification from the Stains of original
 "Sin, or in certain secret Effects and
 "Influences of Grace and Faith upon
 "the Soul, or in Communications of
 "the holy Spirit, to which Man, in his
 "un-

"unregenerate State, could have no Title."*

Our Author urges this Objection again, and with more Clearness, in the following Words. "While Christian Writers are persuaded, that they ought to maintain the natural indefeasible Immortality of the Soul, and its conscious Existence in a separate State, as if this Doctrine was some way connected with the Principles of the Christian Religion, they leave the Deists in Possession of a strong-hold, from whence it seems impossible to dislodge them. For thus they reason: You allow, that a future State of Reward and Punishment may be proved from the Nature of the Human Soul, from the unequal Distribution of Good and Evil in the present Life, from the free Agency of Man, and the Documents of Reason and Nature, importing, that, upon the final Event of Things, the Judge of all the Earth will certainly do right. What Necessity then for

" a

* *Ibid.*

“ a particular Revelation, or a particular Mediator, to inform us of, or to secure to us, certain Privileges, of which we were in Possession without them? ” *

That the *Deists*, who understand as little, as they believe, of Divine Revelation, should reason thus against the Necessity, and, consequently, the Truth of the Christian Religion, is not to be wondered at. But, that a *learned Christian* should think their Argument “ a strong-hold, from whence it seems impossible to dislodge them,” is not a little surprizing. We will try, whether we cannot drive those *Enemies of the Cross of Christ* from this their supposed *impregnable Fortress*.

The Objection stands upon this Ground: That, supposing the Immortality of the Soul, a future State of Rewards and Punishments, and the Justice of God, the Case of Mankind, with Respect to the next Life, is the *very same* by Nature, as we suppose it to be by Grace. And it

it must be confessed, that, if the "Privileges of Nature" equal (our Author's Word is, "transcend") the Riches of "Gospel-Grace," there can be no "Necessity for a particular Revelation, or a particular Mediator, to inform us of, or to secure to us," those Privileges, of which we were in Possession without them."

But, in the Name of our common Christianity, let me ask this Gentleman (for I address myself, not to a Deist, but to a Christian) Is this, really, the Case? Is there no Difference, upon the Supposition of an immortal Soul, between the *State of Nature* and the *State of Grace*? Every Tyro in the Knowledge of the Christian Economy must answer, There is, and a very wide Difference.

By *Nature*, All (even the very best of) Men are *Sinners* in the Sight of God. So St. Paul tells us, *The Scripture hath concluded all under Sin.** And our own Experience of ourselves and our Fellow-Creatures confirms the Truth of the

P

Apostle's

* Gal. iii. 22.

Apostle's Assertion. By Nature, no Sinner can be justified in the Sight of God. For nothing short of perfect Innocence and unfinning Obedience can be a natural Ground of Justification or Acceptance with God. But perfect Innocence and unfinning Obedience, I need not say, are beyond the Reach of such corrupt and degenerate Creatures, as we all are. Whence it is, that the Royal Psalmist, addressing himself to God, says; *Enter not into Judgment with thy Servant, for in thy Sight shall no Man living be justified.** And from hence it follows, by necessary Consequence, that no Man living has, by Nature, a Right or Title to a blessed Immortality. For, in the Order of Things, Justification must precede Salvation or everlasting Life and Happiness.

But, By Grace, the State of Man is the very Reverse of This. For, As by One Man's (Adam's) Disobedience many were made Sinners, so by the Obedience of One (Christ, the second Adam) shall many be made righteous.† The Righteousness

OF

* Psal. cxliiii. 2.

† Rom. v. 19.

or *perfect* Obedience of our blessed Redeemer supplies the Defects of our own *imperfect* Righteousness; and is accepted in the Place of That unfinning Obedience we are utterly unable to pay. Thus are we *justified freely by God's Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ.** And, in Consequence of this our Christian *Justification*, our original Right and Title to a blessed Immortality is *renewed*; and we become qualified to *inherit the Kingdom prepared for us from the Foundation of the World.†*

Thus, then, it appears, from a true State of the Case, that the Doctrine of the *Immortality* of the Soul is far from vacating all Use and Necessity of the Christian Redemption; the *State of Nature*, with Respect to the next Life, being as widely different from That of *Grace*, as a State of Sin from a State of Righteousness, a State of Reprobation from a State of Justification, and no Right to a blessed Immortality from a *sure* Title to That inestimable Privilege

P 2

of

* Rom. iii. 24.

† Matt. xxv. 34.

of the Christian Life. And thus it appears, that there was "a Necessity of
 "a particular Revelation to inform us
 "of, and "a particular Mediator to
 "secure to us, Privileges, of which we
 "were not in Possession without
 "them. To what Purpose, then, is it, to urge,
 that, upon the Supposition of an immortal Soul, there would have been a
 "future immortal State of Being beyond the present Life, and (the Moral
 "Attributes of God pre-supposed) a just
 "Retribution therein, independent of
 "the Doctrine of the Resurrection of
 "the Dead; that is, independent of
 the Christian Redemption? We readily grant, there would. But it must be
 such a Retribution, as is due to Sinners
 by Nature. And, What That is, let the
 professed Design of our Christian Redemption, as represented in Scripture,
 inform us. *God so loved the World* (says
 our blessed Saviour) *that he gave his only-
 begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him,
 should not PERISH, but have everlasting
 Life.*

*Life.** And St. Peter tells us, God is long suffering to us-ward; not willing that any should PERISH, but that All should come to Repentance. † St. Paul says, The preaching of the Cross is to them that PERISH; Foolishness; ‡ and speaks of the Deceivableness of Unrighteousness in them that PERISH; § understanding, by them that perish. Those, who reject the Gospel, and choose to continue in their natural State of Degeneracy and Corruption. Now, in what Sense soever we take the Word PERISH (whether it imports Extinction of Being or actual Suffering) it certainly excludes That *Life and Immortality*, That State of everlasting Happiness, which is brought to Light thro' the Gospel. Let, then, the self-sufficient "Deist" pride himself in his "high Claim to inherent Immortality." ¶ Alas! Without the Christian Redemption, *inherent Immortality* is the greatest Curse a sinful Creature can labour under: *dox:*

* John iii. 16.

† 2 Pet. iii. 9.

‡ 1 Cor. i. 18.

§ 2 Thess. ii. 10.

¶ Dr. Law's Words. *Postscript to Appendix, ubi supra.* p. 419.

der: He is *immortal*, only to be *miserable*. A noble "Privilege of Nature" indeed, and extremely fit to be set in Contrast with "the Riches of Gospel-Grace!"

This may suffice as an Answer to the *Deistical* Objection to the Doctrine of *Natural Immortality*, taken from the Consideration of its necessary Consequence, a future State of *just Retribution*. I am not unaware, that to argue with a Deist from Scripture Doctrine, is, to allege an Authority he professes to reject. But, the Truth is, I am not contending with the *Deists*, but with *Christians*, who personate Unbelievers, and put Objections into their Mouths, the more effectually to gain their End of overthrowing the Doctrine of an *immortal Soul*. And, surely, to Christians, Arguments, drawn from holy Writ, are, of all others, the most cogent and convincing.

But, because there is a *Difficulty*, naturally apt to arise in our Minds, upon a Comparifon between the State of Nature and the State of Grace, I shall, for the Sake of the Christian Reader, pursue the

the Subject, and endeavour, as briefly as I can, to set it clear of all Doubt or Objection.

The Difficulty is, How to reconcile the Case of Mankind, with Respect to the next Life, as it stands by *Nature*, and *exclusive* of the Christian Redemption, with the great fundamental Doctrine of All Religion, both Natural and Revealed, *A future State of Rewards and Punishments*. It is certain, that Sinners by Nature, *unredeemed* Sinners, are capable of such Religion and Virtue, as (we cannot but think) must intitle them to Favour and *Reward* at the Hand of God. Such were many of the great Characters, handed down to us from Pagan Antiquity; and some such, no Doubt, are to be found among the present unenlightened Nations of the Heathen World. But we have seen, that *unredeemed* Sinners are supposed, by the Scriptures, to *perish*, in some Sense or other. And does not this exclude from a future State of *Reward*, and consign over to a State of *Punishment*, All, even
the

the most religious and virtuous of Those,
who never heard of Christ?

We might well leave this Difficulty
(if it really be one) with the Wisdom,
Justice, and Goodness of almighty God;
who can be at no Loss to make the pro-
per Distinctions between his rational
Creatures, according to their respective
Deservings; and who knows how to
temper Judgment with Mercy, and to
reconcile Reward and Punishment to-
gether in one and the same Being. This
is enough to satisfy a reasonable Mind,
and set it at Ease, with Respect to the
Difficulty in question.

But there is a Solution of it, in which
Human Reason cannot but acquiesce
with the most perfect Conviction; and
which not only satisfies all Doubts, but
sets the Wisdom, Justice, and Goodness
of almighty God in the brightest and
loveliest Point of View. This deserves
our most serious Attention, and shall be
distinctly explained.

The Benefits and Advantages of the
Christian Dispensation are evidently of
two

two Sorts, respecting Both States of Man's Existence, That in this World, and That in the next. Those of the first Sort are, The Knowledge of the one only true God, and the proper Worship due to him: Instruction in *Righteousness*, or true Religion and Virtue, and Divine Grace, or the Assistances of the holy Spirit of God. Of the latter Sort are, *Remission of Sins*, and *everlasting Glory and Happiness* in Heaven, thro' the Satisfaction of our blessed Redeemer's Sufferings and Death, and his powerful Intercession for us at the right Hand of God.

The former of these Benefits and Advantages, as peculiar Privileges of the Gospel, are necessarily *confined* to those that name the Name of Christ,* that is, to *Christians*. The latter, we affirm, are extended to the whole Race of Mankind, from the Beginning to the End of Time.

This is a plain Doctrine of the New Testament. St. John describes the Benefits and Extent of the Christian Redemption, in these Words: *If any Man*

*Q*uestions *sin*,
* 2 Tim. ii. 19.

son, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the Propitiation for our Sins; and not for ours only, but also for the Sins of the whole World.* No Critical Torture can restrain the Sense of *ἅλος ὁ κόσμος* (the whole World) within narrower Limits than those of the whole Human Race, the Generations of all Ages, past, present, and to come. And it is with a View to this retrospective Efficacy of the great Christian Sacrifice, that the same Apostle styles our Saviour the Lamb slain (virtually slain) from the Foundation of the World,† that is, as early as, or rather before, the Fall of Man; and that St. Paul speaks of Jesus Christ, the same Yesterday, and To-day, and for ever,‡ not only the same in Nature and Essence, but the same Redeemer, at all Times and Seasons, past, present, and to come.

What Interest the Patriarchs and holy Men of old had in the Christian Redemption, we learn from St. Paul;

where, * 1 John iii. 9. † Rom. xiii. 8. ‡ Heb. xiii. 8.

where, celebrating the Triumphs of Faith in the Persons of Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, &c. he says of them: *These all died in Faith, not having received the Promises, but having seen them afar off; and were persuaded of them, and embraced them; and confessed, that they were Strangers and Pilgrims on the Earth.** That is, "All these fore-mentioned Worthies died in this noble Principle; full of the Hopes, and possessed with the Prospect of future and eternal Felicities. In Expectation of these distant Joys they acted; for these they gave up all Worldly Enjoyments, and looked upon the present Life as nothing but a Passage to a better State."† With Respect to ABRAHAM, the Father of the Faith-
 Q 2

* Heb. xiii. 13.

† Pyle's Paraphrase. Hence the Church of England declares, in her 7th Article, that "both in the Old and New Testament, everlasting Life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man;" and therefore, that they are not to be heard, who feign, that the Old Fathers did look only for transitory Promises."

Faithful, in particular; He had, not only a Promise from God of an universal Blessing, to be conveyed thro' Himself and his Posterity, to all the Families and Nations of the Earth,* but likewise a distant, tho' imperfect, View of the great Christian Sacrifice, in That typical Representation of it, the commanded Sacrifice of his only Son Isaac. † On which Account, our Saviour himself declared to the unbelieving Jews, that their Father Abraham rejoiced to see his (Christ's) Day; and he saw it, and was glad. ‡ And it is very remarkable, that St. Paul, speaking of the future Justification of the Heathen thro' Faith, affirms, that God PREACHED before the GOSPEL to Abraham saying, In thee shall all Nations be blessed. || I might go back to the Head

of
 * Gen. xii. 3. xiii. 18. xxiii. 18.
 † Heb. xii. 17. 18. ‡ John viii. 56.
 || St. Paul's Words are: And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Heathen thro' Faith, preached the Gospel before to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all Nations be blessed. This is an exact Translation of the Original, as we now have it: Προβλεψαντες οτι ο θεος δικαισει τοις εθνεσιν δι' την Πιστιν, ηγγelizεν το ευαγγελιον προτερον Αβρααμ λεγων, εν σοι καταρασονται παντα τα εθνη. found in the Copy from which the old Syriac

of the Human Race; to whom the first Promise of the Christian Redemption was conveyed thro' Him. *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Gal. iii. 8.* But I suspect a Corruption of the Text. For, as it stands, the Word *Scripture* (*ἡ γραφή*) is the Nominative Case to the Verb *preached-before* (*προεκηρύχισατο*); according to which Construction, St. Paul tells us, that the *Scripture* preached to Abraham. Upon which Interpreters generally observe, that the Apostle personifies the Word *Scripture*, speaking of it as of a living Person. But this seems to me too bold a Figure even for the Warmth of St. Paul's Genius. And the Misfortune of this Interpretation is, that, at the Time when the Gospel was preached to Abraham, there was no *Scripture* (*γραφὴ*) in Being. Besides that the Words, in which the preaching of the Gospel to Abraham is made to consist (*viz. In thee shall all Nations be blessed*) are the Words of God himself to that Patriarch. I suspect, therefore, that the Text, as it came from St. Paul, stood thus: Προεὶδὼς δὲ, ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιώσεται τὰ ἔθνη, ὁ Θεὸς προεκηρύχισατο τῷ Ἀβραάμ. &c. i. e. "God, foreseeing (or fore-ordaining) the Justification of the Gentiles by Faith, preached before the Gospel to Abraham, &c." I suppose, that *ἡ γραφή* (the *Scripture*) crept into the Text, thro' the Carelessness of a Transcriber, and that succeeding Copyists, finding it there, thought it necessary to change *προεὶδὼς* into *προεκηρύχισατο*, to make it agree with *γραφὴ*. I acknowledge, I cannot find any Authority for this Emendation. But it seems to me, that some such Reading obtained in the Copy, from which the old Syriac

was made, in that obscure Prophecy,
addressed to the infernal Seducer; I will
put

Version of the New Testament, translated into
Latin By Tremellius, was taken. For the Latin
runs thus: *Nam quia præcognovit Deus, quod per
Eidem justificantur Gentes, prius evangelizavit Abrahæ,
sicut dixit Scriptura, In te benedicentur omnes Gentes.*
If this be a literal Translation, it will, indeed,
replace a *yea*, but in a different Place of the
Text; which will then have stood thus: *Προειδώς
ὁ Θεὸς, &c. τὴν Αβραάμ, ὅτι λέγει ἡ γραφή, ὅτι &c.*

I cannot omit this Opportunity of recom-
mending Tremellius's Translation of the old Syriac
Version to those of the learned, who are unskilled
(as most are) in the Syriac itself. This latter is
by far the oldest Version of the New Testament
extant, being made; if not (as some pretend)
by one of the Evangelists themselves, yet cer-
tainly by one of those Christians, who were pre-
sent with the Apostles at Antioch, (Acts xi. 26.)
and had thereby an Opportunity of consulting
the original Authors on any Difficulty that oc-
cured. This Version is in such high Esteem
with the Learned, that a foreign Writer styles it
certissima, felicissima, et divina omnino Versio. (Frantz.
Tract. de Interpr. Script. P. 1. p. 47.) "a most
faithful, happy, and altogether divine Trans-
lation."

It is of singular Use, for explaining the more
difficult Words and Phrases of the New Testa-
ment, and the more to be depended on, as the
Syriac was the vernacular Tongue, or Language

put Enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed: it shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise his Heel.*

Why was the Christian Redemption made known to Adam, Abraham, &c. if they themselves had no Concern in it? Small Comfort would arise from the Thought, that their Posterity, many Ages afterwards, would be restored to the Divine Favour and a blessed Immortality, while they themselves were left to perish unredeemed. No. The Re-

demption commonly spoken by Christ and his Apostles themselves. We have already seen its Use in clearing up one Difficulty. I will instance in another much more considerable. It is said of Melchisedech, that he was without Father, without Mother, without Descent, having neither Beginning of Days, nor End of Life. Heb. vii. 3. A strange Account of a mere mortal Man, however dignified with the highest Order of Priesthood! But all is plain, easy, and natural in Tremellius's Latin, which stands thus: *Cujus nec Pater nec Mater scripti sunt in Genealogus, neque principium Dierum ejus, neque Finis Vitæ ejus.* i. e. "Of whose Father and Mother, Pedigree, Birth and Death, we have no written Account." Here we see the true Meaning of the Greek *ἀγεννητος, ἀμήτωρ, ἀχρονος* &c.

* Gen. iii. 15.

redemption thro' Christ Jesus was revealed (imperfectly indeed) to Adam and the Patriarchs after him, that they might die in the Faith or Belief of a Redeemer, and with a comfortable Assurance of their own Salvation thro' Him.

This I have always been of Opinion, that the Revelation or Discovery of the Christian Redemption, now imperfect soever to the Patriarchs, affords a strong Proof, that their Descendents could never, at any Time, be without, or wholly ignorant of, a Future State, how little soever it may appear to have engaged their Attention, or influenced their Conduct.

That the Doctrine of Life and Immortality, or a Future State of Happiness, must have been included in That of the Redemption or Salvation of Mankind, I think admits of no Doubt. And can we possibly suppose, that the Patriarchs industriously concealed from their Families and Dependents so important and comfortable a Discovery? Must we not rather believe, they imparted it to them with the utmost Alacrity and Joy? We have a remarkable Attestation, from the Mouth of God himself, to the wise Conduct of Abraham, in the Government of his Family: I know him, that he will command his Children and his Household after him; and they shall keep the Way of the Lord, to do Justice and Judgment. Gen. xviii. 19. i. e. will train up his Children, and influence his Servants, to the Practice of

This *Extent* of the Christian Redem-
 tion to the Times *before* the Gospel is
 possible.

Religion and Virtue. But is it conceivable,
 that, in doing so, *Abraham* should omit to incul-
 cate (what he himself was acquainted with) the
 most powerful Sanction of Religion and Virtue,
 the Doctrine of a Future State; and especially
 at a Time, when there was no Positive Law, but
 only the Will of the Head or Master of the Fa-
 mily, to enforce the Moral and Religious Obe-
 dience of the Subject. And, What should era-
 dicate the Knowledge of a Future State, taught
 by the Patriarchs, from the Minds of their im-
 mediate Successors, or prevent its descending,
 by *Tradition*, to their latest Posterity, I profess I
 cannot see; and especially when it is considered,
 that they must have had the common Notions
 of all Mankind, among which one of the com-
 monest was, the Reality of a *Future State*.

The right reverend Author of the *Divine Lega-
 tion of Moses demonstrated*, who denies "the anti-
 "ent Jews," or "Body of That People, any
 "Knowledge of a future State of Rewards and
 "Punishments, (See *Remarks on several Occasional
 Reflections*, &c. p. 102.) admits the *Premises*, from
 which I draw my *Conclusion*. He acknowledges,
 that "the Mystery of the Gospel was occasion-
 "ally revealed by God to his chosen Servants,
 "the Leaders and Fathers of the Jewish Nation,"
 and, in particular, that "the Command to
 "Abraham to offer up Isaac was an Informa-
 "tion (given at Abraham's earnest Request) in

positively asserted by St. Clement or Clements Romanus, in these Words: "Let
" us

" a representative Action, instead of Words, of the
" Redemption of Mankind by the great Sacrifice
" of Christ." (Ib. p. 110, 111.) And his Lord-
ship expressly allows, that the Jews had That
" Natural Religion," which is " founded in what
" Reason discovers of the Relation between the
" Creator and the Creature; an Aid (he tells
us) " which Revelation is so far from reject-
ing, that we find it constitutes the Ground of
" every extraordinary Dispensation vouchsafed
" by God to Mankind. For He that cometh to
" God (i. e. by Revelation) must believe that he is,
and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek
him. Heb. xi. 6." Julian. 2d. Ed. p. 5.

The Premises thus granted, what hinders the
Conclusion from following? Why, neither in the
History, nor the Compositions, of the antient Jews,
do we ever find them acting on the Motives,
or influenced by the Prospect of a Future State,
or indeed expressing the least Hopes or Fears,
or even common Curiosity concerning it: But
" every Thing they do or say respects the pre-
sent Life only, the Good and Ill of which are
the sole Objects of all their Pursuits and A-
versions." Whereupon his Lordship appeals
to his Adversaries themselves, " Whether, if
they were now first shewn some History of an
old Greek Republic, delivered in the Form
and Manner of the Jewish, and no more No-
tice in it of a Future State, they could possi-

" us look stedfastly to the Blood of
 " Christ, and see how precious his Blood
 R 2 " 18

" bly believe, that That Doctrine was national,
 " or generally known in it." *Remarks, &c.,*
 p. 103, 104.

To which I reply. The Giving of the Law,
 in which (for wise Reasons of God's Providence)
 the Doctrine of a Future State was omitted, and
 the Obedience of the People enforced by Tem-
 poral Sanctions only, had a natural Tendency
 to divert the Attention of the Jews from the
 Things of another Life. And, as they could
 not but conclude, that God, by such a Dispen-
 sation, intended, they should "act on the Mo-
 tives," and be "influenced by the (certain)
 " Prospect of" Temporal " Good and Ill, (a
 Circumstance peculiar to Themselves) This
 would naturally exclude the Consideration of
 future Rewards and Punishments, not only in a
 great Degree from their Thoughts, but from the
 Language of their Compositions or Writings
 likewise. But that the singular Nature of the
 Jewish Dispensation should quite extinguish the
 Light both of *Nature* and of *Traditional Revelation*,
 and destroy all That Knowledge of a Future
 State, which the Jews must have derived from
 the Faith of their Ancestors, and the Exercise of
 their own Reason, is (to me at least) altogether
 incredible.

As to his Lordship's Comparison of the *Jewish*
History with the supposed one of some old Greek
Republic, in which there should be "no more

3. is in the Sight of God; Which being
 offered for our Salvation, has obtained
 the

“Notice of a Future State,” than there is in the
Jewish the Cases are by no Means parallel.
 The *Greek* History is supposed to be quite silent
 as to any Belief of a Future State. The *Jewish*
 actually records the Revelation of That great
 Mystery, in which the Doctrine of *Life and Im-*
mortality is necessarily included, to the Ancestors
 of the Jewish People. In the Case of the *Greek*
 Republic, we should conclude, from the Want
 of the Doctrine of a Future State, that neither
 the People, nor the Founders of their Common-
 wealth, ever had the Knowledge of it. In the
 Case of the *Jews*, From the Certainty, that “the
 Leaders and Fathers of the Jewish Nation”
 were possessed of That Knowledge, we conclude,
 that their Posterity could never be wholly without
 it.

The same Conclusion follows, with great
 Strength of Evidence, from another of his Lord-
 ship's Concessions, viz. “Egypt, as it was the most
 famed for the Arts of Legislation, so it most
 of all inculcated the Doctrine of a future State
 of Rewards and Punishments. Now, if Egypt
 was of the high Antiquity I contend for, the
 Doctrine was inculcated in the Time of the
 Hebrew Captivity. The Israelites, therefore,
 who lived so long in Egypt, and had so tho-
 roughly imbibed the Religious Notions of the
 Place, must needs have been much prejudiced
 in Favour of so reasonable and flattering a

the Grace of Repentance for all the
 "World. Let us search into all the
 "Ages that have gone before us; and let
 "us learn, that our Lord has, in every
 "one of them, still given Place for Re-
 "pentance to all such as would turn to
 "to him. Noah preached Repentance,
 "and as many as hearkened to him
 "were saved. Jonah denounced De-
 "struction to the Ninevites: Howbeit
 "they, repenting of their Sins, appeased
 "God
 "Doctrine." *Remarks, &c.* p. 100. It is a
 Maxim of Horace, and a very just one, that

Quo semel est imbuta recens servabit Odorem
Festa diu. Ep. 2. lib. 1. v. 69.

And therefore the Israelites, having thoroughly
 imbibed the Doctrine of a Future State, during
 their Egyptian Captivity, must have retained a
 Smack of it at least, down to the Time of the Ba-
 bylonish Captivity. And we shall see the greater
 Reason for this Conclusion, when we consider
 That People's extravagant Fondness for every
 Thing they had learned or been accustomed to,
 in the Land of Egypt, particularly with Respect
 to Matters of Religion; and how difficult it is
 to get rid of an early Prejudice, and especially
 when it is in Favour of a most reasonable and flatter-
 ing Doctrine.

“God by their Prayers, and were saved,
 “tho’ they were Strangers to the Cove-
 “nant of God.” *

Nor do we restrain the Christian Re-
 demption to good Men under the *Old*
Testament: We extend it to the virtuous
 and religious of *all* Ages and Nations.
 And this (I think) may be collected,
 with great Force of Evidence, from the
 Scripture Doctrines of the *Resurrection*
 and *Judgment* of Mankind by Jesus
 Christ. *All that are in the Graves* (says
 our

The first Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians.
 Ch. vi. in *Abp. Wake’s Genuine Epistles of the Aposto-
 logical Fathers*. Lond. 1710.

This *Clement* is generally allowed to be the *Cle-
 ment* mentioned by *St. Paul*, (*Phil. iv. 3.*) as his
Fellow-Labourer in the Gospel. And, if so, his
 Words are a great Authority, as he must be sup-
 posed to have perfectly understood the Nature
 of the Christian Dispensation. Certain it is, that
 this wonderful *Epistle* (as some of the Antients call
 it) was in such high Esteem with the primitive
 Church, as to be publicly read in their Assem-
 blies. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 12. 16.* And,
 if we may credit one of the ancient Collections
 of the Canon of Scripture (*Canon. Apost. Can. ult.*)
 it was inserted among the sacred and inspired
 Writings. *Pref. to the Genuine Epistles. p. 5. 6.*

our blessed Saviour) shall hear his Voice (the Voice of the Son of God) and shall come forth; they that have done Good, unto the Resurrection of Life; and they that have done Evil, unto the Resurrection of Damna-
 tion.* And when the Son of Man shall

sit on the Throne of his Glory, to judge the World, before him shall be gathered all Na-
 tions;† It is evident from hence, that

the whole Race of Mankind are con-
 cerned in the Christian Resurrection and
 Judgment. The same Voice will call us

All from our Graves, and the same
 Mouth pronounce the Sentence of Re-
 ward or Punishment on us All. How,

then, can we suppose any Part of the
 Human Species unconcerned in the
 Christian Redemption? Does it not look

as if God designed, the Merits of the
 Redeemer should operate alike to-
 wards the Salvation of All, whom he

shall raise from the Dead, and call to
 Judgment? But the Point is clear from
 the very Terms, in which the Doctrine

(of the Resurrection) is conveyed to us.
 For,

* John v. 28, 29.

† Matt. xxv. 31, 32.

For, What is That *Resurrection of Life*, to which they that have done Good shall come forth from their Graves? Is it not That *Life and Immortality*, That State of endless Felicity, which is brought to Light thro' the Gospel? * And does not St. Peter assure us, that there is no Salvation in any other than Jesus Christ; for there is none other Name under Heaven given among Men, whereby we must be saved. †

It is not, indeed, to be supposed, that, because All Mankind will be judged by Christ, therefore All will be judged by the *Laws of the Gospel*. No. The Divine Justice will certainly make This Difference or Distinction in the *Rule of Judgment*, that Christians alone will be judged by the *Laws of their holy Religion*, and all the rest of Mankind by the *Law written in their Hearts*, ‡ or That respective Degree of Light and Knowledge they enjoyed. But, tho' there will be more than One Rule of Judgment at the great Day, there will be but One Rule of Sentence to be pronounced; and That

* 2 Tim. i. 10. † Acts iv. 12. ‡ Rom. ii. 15.

That will be, the Determination of this Question, Whether the Individual judged be *deserving* of the Christian Salvation, or not. He, who is so, whether a Christian or not, will be saved thro' the Merits of That common Redeemer, who gave himself a Ransom for All, and whose Blood shed on the Cross was a Propitiation for the Sins of the whole World.†

Thus, then (to borrow the Words of a late elegant Writer) "The Sphere of
"Christ's Beneficence extended back-
"wards to the Foundation of the World,
"and reaches forward to the last Con-
"flagration; so that nothing, which is
"capable of being saved, is *hid from the*
"Heat thereof. He became the Saviour
"of all Ages, from the first Birth of
"Time to its last Period; the Father of
"Mankind, from the rising up of the
"Sun, unto the going down of the
"same. The Blessings of his coming
"into the World are as extensive as the
"World, and as lasting as Eternity."‡

And

† 1 Tim. ii. 6.

‡ 1 John ii. 2.

‡ Seed's Sermons, Edinb. 1763. vol. 2. p. 252.

And hence it follows, that, with Respect to the *final State of Retribution*, there is no such Thing, strictly speaking, as a *State of Nature*: The whole World, in That Respect, ever has been, and ever will be, in a *State of Grace*, or capable of Salvation thro' the Merits of Jesus Christ. This gives us a glorious Idea of the Christian Redemption; and affords the most (I might say, the only) satisfactory Answer to That capital Objection to Christianity, Its *Want of Universality* in this World. For, at the Day of Judgment, it will be of no Consequence (unless, perhaps, with Respect to some peculiar *Distinction of Christians* from others of their Fellow-Creatures) in *what Age* of the World Christ was born, or *how far* the Knowledge of his Gospel extended, since ALL, of every Age and Nation, whose Conduct of Life renders them fit Objects of the Divine Mercy and Favour, have an Interest in That Saviour of the World, and will reap the Benefits of his meritorious Passion and Death.

If I have set the Christian Redemption in its *true Light* (as I humbly conceive I have) what becomes of the Deistical Pretence, that, supposing the Immortality of the Soul, and its conscious Existence in a separate State, Man is, by *Nature*, "in Possession of" those very "Privileges," we ascribe to the Christian Redemption, and, consequently, that there was "no Necessity for a particular Revelation to inform us of, or "a particular Mediator to secure to us," those "Privileges?" The Objection appears to be founded in gross Ignorance or Misrepresentation of the Christian Economy; and the Answer I have given it (if I mistake not) effectually "dislodges the Deists," in whose Mouth it is put, "from" That "Strong-Hold," That impregnable Fortress, in which our *Historian* flattered himself he had so securely lodged them.

Let him, then, cease to "pity the" (*supposed*) "Embarrassment of the most "eminent Advocates of Christianity, "when" the above "Objection is urged

"home upon them." They want not
 his Pity: they are not in the least em-
 barrased by the Objection. They can
 as clearly shew (what our Author sup-
 poses they cannot shew) "the peculiar
 "Uses and Importance of the Christian
 "Revelation," as "prove the Truth
 "and Authenticity of it by external
 "Evidence." They can shew the Pro-
 priety of "so eminently powerful a
 "Minister," and "so transcendent a
 "Character, as That of Jesus, at the
 "Head of the Christian Dispensation,"
 by proving, that "his Errand was"
 much "more than to give an additional
 "Testimony to the supposed Discoveries
 of Natural Religion," and, indeed, of
 such a Nature, as not possibly to be
 accomplished by any of the inferior
 "Prophets of the Old Testament," how-
 ever "gifted and instructed" they might
 be "to authenticate Doctrines and Pre-
 cepts, which were already to be found
 in the Works of so many Poets and
 Philosophers, in every Body's Hands." ||
 All

|| See *Short Historical View, &c.* Pref. Disc.
 p. 38, 39.

All This, their Knowledge of true Christianity enables them to do, without giving up the Doctrine of an *immaterial and naturally-immortal Principle* in Man.

SECTION IX.

It is made an Objection, by this Author,* to "the Notion of two Natures "or Principles in Man, independent of "each other" (i. e. a Body and a Soul), that it "is plainly the Foundation, upon "which our moders Pietists, of various "Denominations, build their respective "Systems." He instances in the Doctrine of the *New Birth*, as taught by such Christians; and tells us, it arises from their "conceiving the Influences of "Divine Grace to operate upon the "Soul only, while the Body remains "under all the melancholy Distemperature of its original Corruption." I shall not enquire, whether any of our *Visionaries* talk of *Divine Grace* in this Language. If not, I leave the Objector to the Correction of the *Methodists*, &c.

* *Ibid.* p. 39, 40. If See Short Historical View, &c. Pref. Bile. p. 38, 39.

If the Methodists, &c. misrepresent the *Doctrine of Grace*, I leave Them to the Correction of the Bishop of Gloucester.† It is sufficient to my Purpose, to observe, that the *Abuse* of a Doctrine was never yet admitted as a good Argument against the *Truth* of it. And, therefore, there may be "two Natures or Principles in Man, independent of each other," notwithstanding this "Notion" be "the Foundation upon which our modern Pietists build their (*false*) Systems."

I must, however, so far take their Part, as to join with them in "conceiving, that the Influences of Divine Grace operate on the Soul only." Indeed, I cannot well conceive otherwise; such *Spiritual Impressions or Influences*, as the Gospel ascribes to *Grace*, seeming to me to imply a *Spiritual Substance*, as the proper Ground of their Reception. And, therefore, I cannot but consider the
Christian

† See his Lordship's *Doctrine of Grace, or, the Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit vindicated from the Insults of Infidelity, and the Abuses of Fanaticism*. Lond. 1763.

Christian Doctrine of *Divine Grace*, or the Operations of the holy Spirit of God, as one Proof of an *Immaterial* or *Spiritual Substance* in Man.

It is very remarkable, that our *Historian's* Zeal against the *Immaterial Principle* has led him (inadvertently, perhaps) to discard the great Christian Privilege of *Divine Grace*. For, those same *Pietists* (he tells us) "instead of considering the "Purification of the *whole Man* as the "Work of a gradual Instruction and "Discipline under the Precepts of the "Gospel, hold, that the Redemption, "&c. is *instantaneous*, &c." You see, to what He himself ascribes our Christian *Purification*; namely to "gradual Instruction and Discipline under the Precepts of the Gospel." It seems, then, there is no Necessity of any *supernatural* Operation of the holy Spirit of God, in Order to Christian Perfection. The Work is done in a *natural* Way; and we become good Christians, just as we become good Philosophers or Historians, by the mere Dint of *Instruction* and *Edu-*
cation.

If the Methodists, &c. misrepresent the *Doctrine of Grace*, I leave Them to the Correction of the Bishop of Gloucester.† It is sufficient to my Purpose, to observe, that the *Abuse* of a Doctrine was never yet admitted as a good Argument against the *Truth* of it. And, therefore, there may be "two Natures or Principles in Man, independent of each other," notwithstanding this "Notion" be "the Foundation upon which our modern Pietists build their (*false*) Systems."

I must, however, so far take their Part, as to join with them in "conceiving, that the Influences of Divine Grace operate on the Soul only." Indeed, I cannot well conceive otherwise; such *Spiritual Impressions or Influences*, as the Gospel ascribes to *Grace*, seeming to me to imply a *Spiritual Substance*, as the proper Ground of their Reception. And, therefore, I cannot but consider the Christian

† See his Lordship's *Doctrine of Grace, or, the Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit vindicated from the Insults of Infidelity, and the Abuses of Fanaticism*. Lond. 1763.

Christian Doctrine of *Divine Grace*, or the Operations of the holy Spirit of God, as one Proof of an *Immaterial* or *Spiritual Substance* in Man.

It is very remarkable, that our *Historian's* Zeal against the *Immaterial Principle* has led him (inadvertently, perhaps) to discard the great Christian Privilege of *Divine Grace*. For, those same *Pietists* (he tells us) "instead of considering the
 "Purification of the *whole Man* as the
 "Work of a gradual Instruction and
 "Discipline under the Precepts of the
 "Gospel, hold, that the Redemption,
 "&c. is *instantaneous*, &c." You see, to what He himself ascribes our Christian *Purification*; namely to "gradual Instruction and Discipline under the Precepts of the Gospel." It seems, then, there is no Necessity of any *supernatural* Operation of the holy Spirit of God, in Order to Christian Perfection. The Work is done in a *natural* Way; and we become good Christians, just as we become good Philosophers or Historians, by the mere Dint of *Instruction* and *Education*.

cation. Thus our Author has plainly set aside the greatest and most excellent Privilege of the Christian Life, the *Assistances* of God's holy Spirit co-operating with our Endeavours after Christian Perfection.

SECTION X.

Having, I hope, sufficiently answered the *Objections* of Dr. Law and others, against the commonly-received Doctrine of the HUMAN SOUL, I flatter myself, I have effectually defended That Doctrine.

And now let me ask, What becomes of the heavy Charge, brought against the Christian World in general, by the learned *Master of St. Peter's College, in Cambridge*—of “giving up the peculiar Benefit, and some of the principal Parts of Christianity”—of “complimenting Natural Religion with all the Discoveries and all the Privileges that belong to Revelation”—of “hurting our own Cause, and corrupting Christianity by an impure Mixture of Human Wisdom falsely so called, or by

“ the

“the Dregs of Heathen Philosophy”—
 of “disguising the Face of it, or rather,
 “substituting something else in its Room,
 “and thereby putting Arms into the
 “Hands of Infidels, which they have
 “used but too skilfully against us?”—
 Were this Accusation well founded, it
 would, indeed, be “right to look about
 “us, and see, whether Things cannot
 “be put upon some better Foot,” and
 to endeavour to “make our Posture of
 “Defence” against the Attacks of Infidelity
 “more easy and commodious.”*

But, thanking the Doctor for his kind
 Fears and his friendly Advice, we must
 tell him, we are satisfied with the *Ground*
 we stand on, and the *Posture of Defence* we
 have hitherto maintained. It has enabled
 us to repel the strongest and most
 formidable Attacks of Deism and Infidelity;
 and, we trust, will serve to the
 Defence and Confirmation of the Gospel,
 to the End of Time.

But, there is another Consideration,
 which more powerfully inclines us to
 rest where we are. We are apprehen-
 sive,

T

five,

* *Postscript, ubi supra.* p. 421, 422.

five, that, by following the learned Writer's Advice, in the Choice of our Ground and our Weapons of Defence, we shall "hurt our Cause" still more, and "put fresh "Arms into the Hands "of Infidels, which," we are confident, "they will use but too successful against "us." For, supposing, we should give up the Doctrine of the *Soul's Immortality*, and (as the Doctor expresses it) "rest "upon That solid Rock of a *Resurrec-* "tion," presuming, that "this *Shield* of "Faith is sufficient to protect us;" I verily think, we should supply the Deists with much stronger and more unanswerable Objections to the Truth of the Christian Religion, than any they have hitherto brought against it.

The Doctor is not now to be told, that it is a favourite Principle of the Deists, and a Principle not to be disputed with them, That no Revelation from God can contradict a plain Dictate of Reason and Nature. Now, if there be the strongest Arguments, from Reason and Nature (as the Deist pretends there

there are) for the Existence of an immaterial and immortal Principle in Man, and we affirm the contrary to be the true Doctrine of the Gospel; have not the Deists but too much Reason to object against That Gospel, that, in this Respect, it runs counter to the Reason and Nature of Things? Upon this Footing, I see not, how we can defend Christianity against the Deists, who will be apt to think, they may justly reject all *external Evidence* in Support of a Religion, which, in so essential a Point, sets itself up in Opposition to Reason and Nature. We ought, therefore, before we change our *Posture of Defence*, to be very sure, that the Arguments, usually brought for the natural Immortality of the Soul, are really weak and inconclusive.

In the next Place, the Deist will object, that the Doctrine of *no immaterial Principle in Man* takes away all reasonable Ground of Religion, in Countries unblest with the Knowledge of the Christian Redemption. The Immortality of the Soul (a natural Consequence

of its Immateriality) is the only Foundation of *Nature's* Hopes and Fears, with Respect to a *Future State* of Rewards and Punishments. Destroy this Foundation, and you leave Mankind (Christians only excepted) with no *Prospect of Futurity* or a *Life to come*. For, of a Restoration of Life to the Dead, by a *Resurrection* or Resuscitation of their Bodies, they are supposed to know nothing. Here is no Room for Religion, as a Means of securing our *future* Happiness in another Life. And as to the *present*, the manifest Inequalities in the Distribution of Temporal Good and Evil, afford but slender Encouragement to the Exercise of Religion, as a Means of obtaining the good Things of this World. So that Here is an End of ALL RELIGION.

This Consequence leads to Another, inconsistent with our natural Notions of the Divine Wisdom, Justice, and Goodness. For, take away the Belief of a *Future State* of Rewards and Punishments (which you effectually do, by deny-

denying the Immortality of the Soul) and you leave no possible Way of vindicating, upon the Principles of Reason and Nature, the Wisdom, Justice, and Goodness of God, in the Government of the Moral World. Nothing can reconcile the unequal Distribution of Good and Evil, and, particularly, the Cases of distressed Virtue and triumphant Wickedness, with the Idea of a wise and just Ruler of the World, but the Consideration of a Future State, in which all the seeming Inequalities of his Providence, respecting the present State of Things, shall be set right, and adjusted for Eternity.

Here, by the Way, we have little less than *Demonstration* of Man's *natural Immortality*. For, it may be laid down as a first Principle, that a Doctrine, which is absolutely necessary to the Support of another Doctrine indisputably true, must be *Itself* true. Now, the Doctrine of a *Future State* may be *demonstrated* upon the clearest Principles of Reason and Nature. But, Reason and Nature being

Stran-

Strangers to a *Resurrection* or Restoration of Life to the Dead, it is impossible to prove a Future State, but upon the Supposition of an *immortal Soul*. And thus the *Converse* of this Proposition—"The Soul is immortal, therefore there is a Future State"—is equally true—"There must be a Future State; therefore there is an immortal Soul." But, to return from this Digression.

The Reader sees, how the Dispute must stand between Christianity and Deism, upon the Foot of *no immaterial Principle*, or *no Soul*, in Man; and, I persuade myself, he will be of Opinion, that the adopting That Notion into the Scheme of the Gospel will be so far from enabling us to defend the Religion of Christ with greater Success than we have hitherto done, that we shall not be able to defend it at all, nor ever again convert One thinking, reasonable, Deist, to the Profession of That Religion.

The more we deviate from *Natural Religion*, or (if you like the Terms better) the Dictates of impartial Reason

and

and Nature, respecting Points of Religious Belief and Practice, the wider shall we make the Breach between Deism and Christianity, and the greater the Difficulty of reconciling those (seemingly) inveterate Enemies, tho' (in Truth and Reality) the best of Friends. In Order to their Reconciliation, there must be some *common Principles* admitted on both Sides; and these have hitherto been, The *natural Immortality* of the Human Soul, and a *Future State* of Rewards and Punishments. Exclude these Principles, and you may as well think of bringing together the opposite Points of the Compass, as of reconciling the Christian and the Deist. So far shall we be from reaping those signal Advantages, the learned Person would encourage us to expect from changing our Posture "of Defence," that is, giving up the Immortality of the Soul—the Advantages of "removing the Seat of War into the Enemy's Quarters—driving The Adversary out of all those Holds, which we have so long yielded to him

"him, and from whence he has ever
 "since annoyed us—stripping him of all
 "That Armour in which he now boasts,
 "and plunging him into That Abyss of
 "Darkness and Despair, out of which
 "the feeble Forces of his own frail Rea-
 "son cannot rescue him, nor any Pros-
 "pect of Relief be found." *

Truth, I confess, is not to be sacrific-
 ed to Convenience, nor any real, impor-
 tant, Doctrine of the Gospel to be falsi-
 fied, for the Sake of converting all the
 Infidels in the World.† And therefore,
 were the Doctrine of *Natural Immortality*
 neither to be found in Scripture, nor
 consistent with the Scheme of the Chris-
 tian Redemption, I should be among
 the first to give it up, however the so
 doing might tend to confirm Unbeliev-
 ers in their Opposition to the Christian
 Re-

* *Postscript, ubi supra.*

† This unwarrantable Practice the *Jesuit-Mis-*
sionaries of the Church of Rome (we are told)
 make no Scruple of, in preaching Christianity
 to the Chinese and other infidel People. But St.
Paul said: *If We or an Angel from Heaven preach*
any other Gospel unto you, that That which we have
preached unto you, let him be accursed. Gal. i. 8.

Religion. But, when the Case is far otherwise; when it is evident, that there are no Passages of Scripture, which exclude the Notion of an *immaterial Principle* in Man, but, on the contrary, many that plainly imply it, and One in particular that is a direct *Proof* of it*—when the Doctrine of the *Soul's natural Immortality* appears to be perfectly consistent with That *Life and Immortality*, which are brought to Light thro' the Gospel, and with all the *Privileges* and *Benefits* of the Christian Covenant—When this, I say, is the Case, we must be excused, if we choose to retain and hold fast a Doctrine, without which we can neither bring over Unbelievers to Faith in Christ, nor defend our holy Religion against the Attacks of Infidelity: A Doctrine, besides, which, as it admits of the clearest Evidences of Reason and Nature, so is it supported by the *General Consent* of Mankind, in all Ages and Nations of the

* Viz. Our Saviour's great Argument against the Sadducees, in those Words, *God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living*. See Sect. 4.

the World: A Circumstance, which has ever been considered as a strong presumptive Argument for the Truth of any Doctrine or Opinion, as it plainly implies, that such Doctrine or Opinion is the clear Dictate of That *Reason*, which is common to all Mankind, and That *Light of Nature*, which shines, with more or less Brightness, in all Countries of the Earth.

SECTION XI.

I must not omit taking Notice of That Plea for Indulgence, in opposing the commonly-received Doctrine, with which our *Historian* concludes his *Prefatory Discourse*. "As the Church of *England* herself" (says he) "hath declined, in the most solemn Declaration of her Tenets, to interpose her Judgment of this Controversy, for more than two hundred Years; and gives Countenance to the Notion of a *conscious intermediate State*, no otherwise than by some ambiguous Expressions, in one of her Offices, which, of

“ all others, and by the Confession of
 “ all Parties, wants most to be correct-
 “ ed; it is not only *unfair*, but *inhuman*,
 “ for one Sett of her Members to brand
 “ another with HERESY, merely for
 “ holding the negative Side of this Ques-
 “ tion.”

To which I reply. It is true, that
 there is no Decision of this Controversy
 to be found in the present *Articles* of the
Church of England. But the Church did
 actually “ interpose her Judgment” of
 it, not more than twelve or thirteen
 Years before our Author’s “ two hun-
 “ dred Years;” and he himself has pro-
 duced That *Judgment*.* It makes the
 40th *Article* of those drawn up and agreed
 upon, in the Reign of *Edward VI. A. D.*
1552. and runs in these Words: “ They,
 “ who say, that the Souls of such as de-
 “ part hence do sleep, being without all
 “ Sense, Feeling, and Perceiving, until
 “ the Day of Judgment, or affirm that
 “ the Souls die with the Bodies, and at
 “ the last Day shall be raised up with
 U 2 “ the

* *Short Historical View.* p. 24, 25.

"the same, do utterly dissent from the
"right Belief, declared unto us in the
"holy Scripture." †

It is evident from this Article, that
the Church of England *has* expressly
and formally condemned That State of
absolute *Insensibility*, or (as Dr. *Law* calls
it) "temporal Cessation of Thought"
(whether arising from the Sleep, or the
Death, or the Non-Existence, of the
Soul) which the Writers I oppose con-
tend for, as the true State of Man be-
tween Death and the Resurrection.

But we are told, that "whatever was
"the Motive with King *Edward's* Refor-
"mers to declare against the Sleep of
"the Soul in this peremptory Manner;
"when the Articles came to be review-
"ed in 1562, by *Parker* and his Affoci-
"ates, this 40th Article was dropped; in
"Consideration, it should seem, that by
"allowing *separate* Souls to have Sense,
"the Doctrines of Purgatory and Invo-
"cation would naturally follow." ‡

It

† *Collier's Eccl. Hist.* vol. 2. Records No. 66.

‡ *Hist. View.* p. 26.

It is true, indeed, this 40th of King Edward's Articles was omitted by the Convocation in Queen Elizabeth's Time; and so were the 39th, the 41st, and the 42d.* The Reason of which Omission not appearing (that I can find) in our Ecclesiastical Histories, I am at Liberty to reject That assigned by our Historians, and to offer another of my own. I conceive, then, that the Heresy of the Soul-Sleepers, which, in 1552, might be pretty rife, was dwindled away, and become unworthy of Notice, in 1562; and as it was an Opinion, not likely (on Account of its Absurdity) to disturb the Peace of the Church in future Times; and besides, there being no Dispute concerning the Immortality of the Human Soul, between the Romish and Reformed Churches; Archbishop Parker and the Convocation might omit the Article in Question as useless, and unnecessary to the Support of the Reformation. And I am confirmed in this Opinion by the Subjects of the three other rejected Articles,

* Collier, ib.

articles, whose Titles are, 39. *The Resurrection of the Dead is not yet brought to pass.* 41. *The Hereticks called Millenarii.* 42. *All Men shall not be saved at the Length.* I make no Doubt, that the Clergy thought the Doctrines, condemned in these Articles, not likely to infect many of the established Church, and therefore laid aside the Articles themselves as of little or no Use.

But, tho' the Church of England be silent in her Articles, she speaks out in her Liturgy, and plainly enough "interposes her Judgment of this Controversy." Our Author pretends, she "gives Countenance to the Notion of a conscious intermediate State no otherwise than by some ambiguous Expressions in one of her Offices," meaning That *for the Burial of the Dead.* But, in the Name of common Sense, Can Words more clearly, strongly, and with less Ambiguity, express the Notion of two Natures in Man, and the Survivorship of the one, in a State, not only of Consciousness, but of Happiness, than the Beginning of

That

That Prayer, Almighty God, with whom do live the Spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the Souls of the Faithful, after they are delivered from the Burden of the Flesh, are in Joy and Felicity—? If these are ambiguous Expressions,

I am yet to learn my Mother Tongue, and to be taught the Difference between perspicuous and doubtful Language—

But the Office for the Burial of the Dead, of all others, and by the Confession of all Parties, wants most to be corrected. Perhaps, it may; but not on

Account of the Doctrine in Question (as this artful Writer would insinuate) but

for another Reason, which I will tell

the Reader—Because it is evidently

calculated for the Burial of good Chris-

tians only (the faithful, or them that de-

part hence in the Lord) and yet is ap-

pointed to be used at the Interment of

All, not excepting the very wickedest.

In short, the Church of England, through-

out her Liturgy and her Homilies, in her

devotional and doctrinal Language, de-

clares, as plainly as Words can express

her

her Meaning, for the Doctrine I have been defending—the Doctrine of the Human Soul, as a *Spiritual Substance*, united with the *Human Body*, and surviving, in a *conscious intermediate State*, the Dissolution of the Material Frame.

SECTION XII.

We are the more concerned to defend this Doctrine of the Church of England, and, indeed, of all the Christian Churches in the World, as the Opposition to it aims at nothing less than the unsettling long-established Notions, rooting up Foundations, and introducing quite new *Ideas* and a new *Language* into the DIVINITY of Christians.

Should the Doctrine of these Writers prevail, we must discard the received *Ideas* of the Creature MAN, and entertain very different ones. Instead of considering him as a Being compounded of two Parts, a *material Body* and an *immaterial Soul* or *Spirit*, we must look upon him as a Being formed of *Matter only*—Instead of supposing him to have a
distinct

distinct Principle of Thought, Reason, Judgment, &c. we must suppose his intellectual and rational Faculties to be the *natural Result* of his *Bodily Frame*, or *supernaturally* added thereto by the Author of his Being—Instead of considering *Death* as nothing more than the Dissolution of Man's Bodily Frame, his Soul surviving and continuing to live after its Separation from the Body; we must suppose him entirely *destroyed* as one of God's Creatures, as *annihilated* or reduced to his original *Nothing*—And, instead of considering the Restoration of Man, at the Resurrection, to his former State of Being, by a Reunion of his Soul and Body; we must understand it in the Light of a *new Creation*, and That in as full and absolute a Sense, as the original Formation of *Adam* out of the Dust of the Earth.

We might almost trust the Decision of the Controversy to a fair Comparison between these *opposite Ideas* of the Creature *Man*. For, Which of the two Notions, the *old* or the *new*, bids the fairest

W

to

to be the true Notion, will, I think, admit of but little Doubt with any Man, who seriously attends to the following **Query**—Whether it be most agreeable to the Divine Wisdom, and the Methods of Divine Providence, as far as we can judge of them—to annex *Spiritual Powers*, such as Intellect, Reason, &c. to a System of *Matter*, naturally incapable of them—to destroy, for a Time, the *whole Being* of Creatures designed for an Eternity of Existence—and, in Order to That Existence, to call them, a second Time, out of Nothing—Or—to unite with the Human Body a *Spiritual Substance*, the *natural Substratum* of Thought, Reason, &c.—to continue Life and Activity to *One Part*, at least, of Beings designed for Immortality—and to restore the Man by a Re-union of his disjoined and separate Parts.

I am aware, What Kind of Reception this Query is likely to meet with, from such as pronounce & all *Philosophical Arguments*, drawn from our Notions of Matter, against the Possibility of Life

Dr. Law's Appendix, p. 414.

“Life, Thought, and Agency being so
 “connected with some Portions of it,
 “as to constitute a compound Being or
 “Person,” to be “merely grounded on
 “our Ignorance.” * But I am not here
 contending with these Gentlemen. I
 appeal to such as entertain a more fa-
 vourable Opinion of *Philosophical* or *Me-
 taphysical* Reasoning; and, if to such the
latter Hypothesis shall appear, at the first
 Proposal, and without farther Consider-
 ration, to be the most reasonable and
 probable of the two; this will naturally
 lead them to suspect the Objections
 brought against it, whether from Reason
 or Scripture, of Weakness and Fallacy;
 and add Weight to the Answers I have
 endeavoured to give those Objections.
 But, to return:

Besides the Introduction of *new Ideas*
 into our *Divinity*, we must teach it to
 speak a *new Language*. It will be absurd
 to talk any more of *caring for our Souls*,
saving our Souls, &c. when there is, re-
 ally, no such Thing as a *Soul*, in the

* Dr. Law's Appendix, p. 414.

common Acceptation of the Word, to be *cazed for* or *saved*. What Kind of Language is to be substituted in the Place of That we are to lay aside, I much Question, whether the Objectors have considered and determined.

Nor will this Change of Language affect only all future Compositions on the Subjects of Religion and Morality. It must have a Retrospect to those already in Being. Our *Bibles*, indeed, we may preserve, by understanding the Word *Soul* in the Senses given of it by the *Master of Peter-House*. But, what shall we do with our *Liturgy*, which plainly supposes the Distinction of Body and Soul? It must undergo another *Review*, and the improper Word *Soul* be exchanged for some other, or explained to another Sense.

Nor is this the worst of the Case. The many excellent Books of Religion and Morality, which have been written in all Ages of the Church, particularly the latest, must be rejected and laid aside, as *abounding* with the HERESY of an *imma-*

immaterial and naturally-immortal Principle in Man. And the Clergy, to their no small Regret and Trouble, will be obliged to destroy all their *Sermons*, and provide a new Set of more *orthodox* Discourses for the *Pulpit*.

It is to be hoped, the Writers, I have been contending with, will consider these Consequences, and be well assured of the Necessity and Truth of their Doctrine, and the Futility of the Answers here given it, before they take any farther Pains to bring about so great and momentous a *Revolution* in the *Ideas* and *Language* of **CHRISTIAN DIVINITY.**

the Distinction of Body and Soul, must undergo another Review, and the improper Word Soul be exchanged for some other, or explained to another sense.

Not is this the worst of the Case. The many excellent Books of Religion and Morality, which have been written in all Ages of the Church, particularly the latest, must be rejected and laid aside, **POST** binding with the Heresy of an

P O S T S C R I P T.

HAVING, in the *Preface*, mentioned Dr. Coward, Author of *Second Thoughts on Human Soul*, and Mr. Dodwell, Author of an *Epistolary Discourse* against the Immortality of the Soul, as the *Predecessors* of those Writers, whose *Objections* to the commonly-received Doctrine I undertook to answer; and the former (Dr. Coward and Mr. Dodwell) having opposed That Doctrine with Arguments from *Reason* and *Philosophy*, as well as from *Scripture*; I have thought it not improper (in Order to render my *Defence* more complete) to lay before the Reader the principal of those *Philosophical Arguments* or *Objections* against an immaterial and naturally-immortal Principle or Soul in Man; with an Answer to each.

OBJEC-

OBJECTION I.

It seems most agreeable to Reason, that a *mortal*, and not an *immortal*, Soul should be joined with a *mortal Body*, according to the antient Adage, *Simile gaudet sibi simili*.

Answer.

As this is a mere *Prejudice*, it must give Way to those Arguments, which prove the *actual Union* of an *immortal Soul* with a *mortal Body*.

OBJECTION II.

If we cannot account for the Faculties of *Thinking*, *Understanding*, *Willing*, &c. without supposing an *immaterial Principle*, united with the *Human Body*; then must we allow the same Advantage to the *Brutes*, in whom those very Faculties, in some Degree, are found; and therefore, if *Immortality* be a necessary Consequence of *Immateriality*, we must admit, that *Brutes* have, not only *immaterial*, but *immortal Souls*. Which

evi-

evidently destroys the proper *Distinction* between the *Rational* and *Brute* *Creation*.

Answer.

We safely may, nay, I think, we must, allow the Animals below us an *immaterial Principle* (or *Soul*, if you please) to account for their Actions, which are, evidently, not *mechanical*, but *spontaneous*. But it will not follow, that the Souls of Brutes are immortal, at least not in the Sense, in which we ascribe *Immortality* to the Souls of Men. For, Brutes not having That *Perfection* of Reason and Liberty, which are necessary to constitute *Moral Beings*, nor, consequently, being proper Objects of *Reward* or *Punishment*; their Souls, of whatever Kind they be, were, certainly, not created for a future State of *Happiness* or *Misery*; and, therefore, we may reasonably suppose, will be *annihilated* or reduced to *Nothing* by their *Death*. And this seems to be the *Doctrine* of the *Preacher*, in those Words, Who

*Who knoweth the Spirit of Man that goeth upward, and the Spirit of the Beast that goeth downward to the Earth? ** There remains, then, the proper Distinction between the Rational and Brute Creation.

OBJECTION III.

If the Human Soul, as well as all other created Beings, *depends* (as it most certainly does) for its Existence, both

X

as

* *Eccles. iii. 21.* Dr. Law supposes the Meaning of the *Preacher* to be, either that "No Body knows the Difference between the Spirit of Man and the Spirit of the Beast;" or, that "the Spirit of Man is fitted for, and has a Tendency towards Things which are above this Earth, and therefore must be designed by its Creator for Things superior to the mere Animal Life; but the Spirit of a Beast grovels upon the Earth, and is wholly confined to low, animal, sensitive Life." *Append. to Considerations, &c. p. 404.* The Reader is at Liberty to choose which Sense of the Words he likes best, as my *Argument* is no Way affected thereby; tho' I cannot but observe, that the plain and obvious Meaning of the Words *goeth upward* and *goeth downward to the Earth* seems to point out, not the different *Natures* or *Tendencies*, but the different *Fates* or *Events*, of the Human and Bestial Spirits.

as to the Manner and Duration of it, on the Will and Pleasure of God; it cannot be *naturally immortal*, or of such a Nature, that it must of Necessity continue to exist and act, after its Separation from the Body.

Answer.

This Objection is founded in a mistaken Notion of the Soul's *natural Immortality*; by which is to be understood, that it is naturally *incapable* of *Dissolution* by those Causes, which bring about the Dissolution of the Body; and, consequently, that it will continue to live and act, even *for ever*, unless almighty Power shall interpose to destroy its Being. This is the Case with the *Angels* themselves, who, tho' certainly by Nature *immortal*, are yet so far dependent on the Will of God for their Existence, that it is in his Power to annihilate, or put an End to that Existence.

OBJECTION IV.

If the *essential Properties* of the Soul are *perishable*, the Soul itself cannot be

hence

X

natu-

naturally immortal. This is the Case with the Faculties of Thought, Understanding, and Reason. They may be, and often are, greatly impaired, and even destroyed, during the Life of the Body. In deep Sleep or a *Deliquium* (*fainting away*) the Soul ceases to think. In Idiots and Madmen, the Powers of Understanding and Reason are of so little Use, they may justly be considered as lost or destroyed.

Answer.

If *Thinking* be *essential* to the Soul, it will follow, that the Soul *always* thinks, even in the deepest Sleep, and in a *Deliquium* itself; tho' Bodily Indisposition may prevent our recollecting that it did so. As to the Case of Idiots and Madmen, their Powers of Understanding and Reason are not, properly speaking, lost or destroyed, but only obstructed in their Operations. That the Soul, under every Bodily Indisposition, retains its *Capacity* of thinking, understanding, and reasoning, is evident from

hence, that the Removal of the Indisposition restores to us the full Use of those Powers. At the very Instant of our awaking out of Sleep, we are conscious of Thought; and when a Madman recovers his Senses, he recovers with them the right Use and Exercise of his Rational Faculties. Now, if the essential Properties of the Soul be not *perishable*, the Soul itself may be naturally immortal.

OBJECTION V.

Whatever owes its very Being to Matter, must be, in its own Nature, corruptible or mortal. The Human Soul, as well as Body, is generated from the Seminal Principle of the Parent: Otherwise, Man does not generate Man, for neither Soul nor Body separately are Man. The Soul, therefore depends on Matter for its very Being.

Answer.

The Reason, here given, Why the Parent generates both Body and Soul, is

is a mere Quibble. It is certain, we are born Men, the Union between Body and Soul being perfected, before we come forth from the Womb, so that Man may very properly be said to generate Man, or propagate his Species. If it be true (as most certainly it is) that Matter cannot generate Spirit, the Soul cannot be *ex traduce*, or derived from the Seminal Principle of the Parent; and therefore must have its Origin immediately from the *Father of Spirits*.^{*} At what Time, and in what Manner, the Union between Soul and Body, in the Womb of the Mother, takes Place, is among the unfearchable Ways of Divine Providence.

OBJECTION VI.

Nothing that is *passible*, or capable of being acted upon, or of suffering (as the Soul manifestly is) can be naturally immortal.[†]

Answer.

^{*} Heb. xii. 19. The Reason here given is, We have already seen this Objection urged by the Author of *Universal Restitution*, in the following Words: "Common Sense may teach us,

Answer.

This Objection proves only against *necessary*, not against *natural*, *Immortality*: That is, a *passible* Being cannot be *self-existent*, as God is; but it may be incapable of being destroyed by any *Natural Cause*. An *Atom*, or perfectly solid Particle of *Matter*, is incapable of being destroyed, or even divided, by any Power of Nature, tho' it be as capable of being moved or acted upon, as any compound Body. Why, then, may not the Soul be capable of being acted upon and suffering, and yet be *indissoluble* by any Thing but the Power of God?

"that whatsoever is passible (as the Soul is)
 "must also be mortal in its own Nature, since
 "Passion or Suffering tends to Dissolution, and
 "so to Death." See *Section VI*.

F I N I S.